Helen Fingerle

MINUTES

OF

ANNUAL MEETINGS

OF

The Old German Baptist Church

(CLASSIFIED)

From 1778 to 1943

AND

APPENDIX

DESIGNED FOR THE PROMOTION OF
THE PEACE AND HARMONY
OF THE BROTHERHOOD

Published by authority of the
Annual Meeting

J. M. KIMMEL, A. R. KING AND
ERVAN EIKENBERRY

Publishing Committee.

Press of
THE BRETHREN PUBLISHING COMPANY
Ashland, Ohio
1944

Reporting to the A. M. of 1942, we were again retained and required to get a new minute book printed, and it was left to our judgment as to what form it should be in. After further observation of the sentiment in the Brotherhood, it seemed that the prevailing desire was for the classified form. Accordingly, we proceeded as soon as practicable with the difficult and somewhat perplexing task of classification and after devoting considerable time and thought to it, succeeded in bringing it to a conclusion, except minor details, in March, 1943. But owing to the existing national emergency arising from the involvement of our country in the great international conflict known as World War II, business was so affected that for a considerable time we were unable to obtain definite terms anywhere for the publication of this work; hence the delay in issuing it.

In the performance of this work of classification it was our sincere aim to include all the published decisions and actions of our annual conferences without any explanatory notes or comments, just as they appear in our Book of Minutes, omitting only superfluous statements, queries without answers and such matter that was of merely passing interest and use, but has become ineffective and of no further value. We have also omitted from the later minutes all queries that were before the A. M. that were laid down or returned, as was done in the last edition of the Book of Minutes.

In general we have followed the plan of the Brethren's Encyclopedia, a classification of the minutes of A. M. with explanatory notes, compiled by Elder Henry Kurtz and published by him in 1867. This work as revised and republished by Owen C. Cripe in 1922, we used as a guide as far as we found it to our purpose, but did not confine ourselves to it. For comparison of arrangement we repeatedly referred to a classification of minutes of annual meetings as prepared by Elder S. S. Mohler, published in 1886. Besides these helps, our thanks are due also to Elder Charles Garber who assisted us personally in the work of classification.

We endeavored to arrange the various subjects alphabetically, each subject having the Articles belonging to it, placed under it in the order of date of passage. It was often very difficult to decide in what class Articles properly belonged, different subjects being involved in many of them, making them complex. Hence, some Articles may appear unsuited to the class in which they are placed. However, by the help of some inserted references and the index, we think there will be little difficulty in finding any Article desired.

For convenience this work is arranged in seven divisions, as follows:

I. The decisions of Annual Meetings as presented in Articles and classified.
II. Petitions, Propositions and Statements to Annual Meeting.
III. Reports to Annual Meeting.
IV. Standing Committees.
V. Committees to Churches.
VI. Time and Place of Annual Meetings.
VII. Appendix.

1. Reconsidered Minutes.
2. Brethren's Reasons, including
The Resolutions of August 24, 1881.

We realize that this work will not be found free of imperfections, but we trust, nevertheless, that our earnest efforts to avoid mistakes in the preparation of it, will be appreciated by sympathetic readers and that whatever errors may be discovered in it will be overlooked as of the head and not of the heart. Our prayer is that the result of our diligent labors will not be in vain, but that under the blessing of God, it may make a practical knowledge of the Counsels of the Church more readily available and more easily understood and thereby greatly promote and increase peace, love and union in our beloved Brotherhood.

JOHN M. KIMMEL,
ARTHUR R. KING,
ERVAN EIKENBERRY.
Committee

NOTE—Elder Arthur R. King having migrated to California from Ohio, the above preface was submitted to him for his endorsement and, without any reasonable doubt, would have received his approbation had his death not intervened.

Classified Minutes
of the
ANNUAL MEETINGS of the BRETHREN

ANNUAL MEETING

Manner of Holding

1813 ART. 3. "It has been also again requested of, and counseled by the old brethren, that the great (annual) meeting should be continued in the order as it has been heretofore declared and laid down by the old brethren, viz.: that the ministers and overseers of the churches, every one in his own district and church, should in good time lay it before the church, how some should be willing to go to the big (annual) meeting, and that the church should assist them, if possible, that some may be able to go, so that from all parts, and if it could be from all churches, some may come to that meeting; and those that will come should endeavor to arrive on Thursday evening so near to the place of meeting as to be able to be at the place Friday morning at nine o'clock, that the business may go on without hindrance."

1832 ART. 8. Change of the time of yearly meeting. Meeting to commence on Penticost, with public meeting and love-feast. Monday and Tuesday, council meeting.

1835 ART. 14. Concerning the commencement of yearly meetings on Saturday, or according to the ancient order. No change made at this time.

1836 ART. 4. How is it deemed best at the yearly meeting, whether first to hold council, or first public meeting and communion? It was considered as expedient, to commence on Lord's day with public meeting, and in the evening to break the bread of communion, and afterward to hold council.

1837 ART. 3. How it is considered, to make a better arrangement in holding annual meetings according to the pattern of the apostles? (Acts xv.) The unanimous counsel of this meeting and desire of the old brethren is, to follow the track of the apostles as closely as possible. Therefore the council-meeting ought to consist of the elders and all the members of that church which receives the meeting, and of such teachers, ministers, or (private) members, who may be sent as delegates from the other churches. It is considered necessary that every church, or, where the distance is too great, several churches together, should send two, three or more delegates to the annual meeting. The yearly meeting is to take place as heretofore on Pentecost, or Whitsuntide, and the council-meeting to be held on Friday and Saturday before, to which end the delegates ought to arrive in the neighborhood on Thursday evening. The public meeting begins on Sunday, when a love-feast will be held, and the church is at liberty to invite thereto also neighboring churches as usual. The proceedings of the council-meeting should be immediately recorded in writing, and as much as possible communicated to all the churches.

1845 ART. 13. About the order of Annual Meetings, it was concluded to refer the consideration of this query to the next Yearly Meeting, with the recommendation to the consideration of all the churches.

1846 ART. 1. As regards the way and manner of holding Annual Meetings, so as to enjoy more order, convenience, and satisfaction, it was considered, in the fear of the Lord, that the counsel of the Yearly Meeting in the year 1837, in this respect, was proper and expedient, if observed, and that the best plan will not mend the matter if it is not carried out. Different plans were proposed, and, after a long discussion and mature reflection, it was resolved to make no material change but this: That our western brethren shall have the privilege of taking the Yearly Meeting every other year, if they request it, and that our eastern brethren should not fail to attend the same; that it should be explicitly understood and given out, that Friday and Saturday there will only be private council-meeting—all the ordained elders to form the committee to take in and bring before the meeting those matters to be considered. The public meeting should be on Sunday, and, if possible, not in the same place where the council-meeting is held.

1847 ART. 1. Whether we could not amend our plan in holding our Yearly Meetings, that the business might be conducted more quietly and orderly? Concluded, in regard to our Yearly Meetings, that the brethren meet on Saturday, before Pentecost, and have public meeting till Sunday evening. Love-feast to be held either on Saturday or Sunday evening, at the option of the church where the Yearly Meeting is held. On Monday the council-meeting to begin, and continue until all the business is transacted or disposed of. The council to consist of delegates, not more than two, to be sent from each church, with a written certificate, containing, also, the queries to be presented (by the church whom they represent) to the Yearly Meeting. The delegates to constitute a committee of the whole, to receive and examine all matters communicated to the Yearly Meeting, and to arrange all the queries and questions for public discussion; and after they are publicly discussed, and the general sentiment heard, then the delegates are to decide; and if two-thirds or more of the delegates agree, let the decision thus made be final; but if the nature of the case be such that two-thirds do not give their consent, let it be delayed, until it receives the voice of at least two-thirds of the legal representatives. The Yearly Meetings to be attended by as many teachers and members as may think proper to do so, and the privilege in discussion to be free and open to all who may desire to participate in the same, as heretofore.

1847 ART. 13. As it was deemed necessary to be done, this meeting, therefore, in the conclusion, would advise all the elders and teachers, faithfully to labor in their respective congregations, to settle and reconcile all matters of difference that may take place among them, as far as possible, and not to embarrass the councils of the Yearly Meeting with such local cases, that might be disposed of at home, where all the facts may be more easily and fully obtained; yet after repeated efforts being made to effect a reconciliation, without success, we then conceive it to be the privilege of the brethren to call in the elders, from one or more of the adjoining congregations, to assist and should this be done without success, it is then the privilege of the brethren, if they think proper, to refer the case to the Yearly Meeting, with as many of the facts and evidences connected with the same as may be convenient to transmit.

1848 ART. 29. The committee to whom the letters concerning our Yearly Meetings had been referred, reported as follows: No less than twelve letters, from all parts of the church, had been presented in regard to this important matter, and after reading and weighing them all, and taking also in view the general state of feeling and experience of the present meeting, we propose the following in the fear of the Lord: Considered, that this Yearly Meeting is as anxious and unanimous in the desire of following in the track of the apostles (Acts xv.) as our beloved brethren were eleven years ago, at the Yearly Meeting in 1837. We find, however, by experience, that the change of the time of holding the council **after** public meeting doth work well—removing from us the great crowd of strangers. We are also satisfied that the sending of delegates or messengers from all the churches is necessary and proper, as also that all the elders, who come to us, ought to be members of the meeting, whether sent or not. A general committee of five or seven elders is to be appointed, as heretofore, and as many special committees as may be deemed proper or necessary in order to dispatch business. But, as to voting, we hold that it will be best to aim always at unanimity, and dispose of business as hitherto. Should the meeting, not be able to agree on any one point, let it be postponed to a future meeting. In addition it was proposed that all the churches should be admonished to use every diligence in sending, every year, two delegates, or at all events one to the Yearly Meeting. The above was unanimously adopted, without a dissenting voice.

1848 ART. 31. As to our next regular Yearly Meeting, on Pentecost, 1849, there was but one invitation, viz., from our brethren in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, and it was therefore agreed, with divine permission, to meet there in Annual Meeting, on Saturday before Pentecost, the 26th of May, 1849.

Having thus far finished the task before us, with singular unanimity and dispatch, and feeling, with deep humility, that not unto us, nay, not unto us, unworthy instruments, but to God and his signal blessing, was due all honor and glory, the brethren united once more in singing a hymn, and bowing themselves in the praises and thanks to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and commending ourselves, and the churches in union with us, to the God of our salvation; fervently praying that He, in tender mercy, would continue to let His light shine upon us; lead us and guide us through all dangers and difficulties, make us useful instruments in his hands for the edification of His church, and to the conversion of a sinful world, and finally save us with an everlasting salvation, through our crucified Redeemer, Jesus Christ. Amen.

Lastly, at the parting meal, Wednesday noon, it was proposed, and heartily responded to by all, to recommend every Monday of our future Annual Meetings as a day of general fasting and prayer, not only to the members that may be gathered at the place of meeting, but to all the members in every part of the Lord's vineyard, who yet desire to be faithful, and to see all the household of faith continue steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine, and in fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers, even until He comes, who hath said, "Surely, I come quickly." Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with us all. Amen.

1849 ART. 45. Whether it would not be best, at our Annual Meetings, for the committee to investigate the letters on Saturday, in order that the business might be more readily disposed of on Monday? Considered, that the present arrangement is probably as good as we could adopt.

1850 .ART. 26. Why the Annual Meeting was not conducted, or carried out, according to the order or plan laid down at the Yearly Meeting, 1847? Considered, that the querists shall be referred to the Minutes of Yearly Meeting, 1848, Art. 29, where twelve letters are mentioned, which contained chiefly remonstrances against said plan.

1851 ART. 9. Would it not be better to alter the plan of holding our Annual Meeting, so as to have no public preaching but only a church council-meeting? Considered, that at this time we would make no more alteration but this, that instead of meeting on Friday, and having public meeting on Saturday and Sunday, we will come together on Saturday evening, and meeting to commence on Sunday morning, and to be no communion meeting at the place of the Annual Meeting; the council-meeting then to commence on Tuesday morning.

1853 ART. 13. Could not the brethren adopt a plan to hold the Yearly Meetings in such a manner that public preaching might be held in the neighborhood around, and not at the place for council? Concluded, to make no change for the present.

1855 ART. 27. Would it not be right to hold a love-feast, after all matters are settled, at the Yearly Meeting, inasmuch as many of us will never see each other again (in this life), and thus show, also, a pattern to all the brethren, how it ought to be held? Considered it best to have no love-feast at our Annual Meetings, as the number of people present is so large.

1857 ART. 31. Would it not be advisable to change the time of holding our Annual Meetings, as Whitsuntide comes too early some seasons, especially in some parts of the country? Answer: We judge it best to make no change in the time of holding our Annual Council.

1864 ART. 36. It having been agreed upon, at a former time, that our Yearly Meetings should be held alternately in the east and west, the Allegheny Mountains being considered the dividing line, it is requested that this meeting change that line to the Ohio River. This request was granted.

1864 ART. 37. Would it not be good to make some change in holding our Yearly Meetings, for the purpose of preventing so great a multitude of people from being present? And would it not, also, be better to have the conference more private, and not to name on the minutes who were chosen on the standing committee, or who was clerk, etc.? Answer: We think it not expedient to make any change at this time.

1865 ART. 1. Could not this Annual Meeting make some change in the manner of holding our Annual Meetings, which would be advisable and acceptable to the brotherhood? Answer: This meeting feels the importance of a change, but, not to make any change too hastily, it appoints the following committee to take this matter into consideration to propose the result of their wisdom and labor to the next Annual Meeting, for its acceptance or rejection: D. P. Saylor, Philip Boyle, Benjamin Moomaw, Andrew Derrick, J. H. Umstad, John Wise, H. D. Davy, John Hershey, Jacob Miller, Hiel Hamilton, Christian Long, John Metzger, David Brower, and Frederick Loehr.

Report of Committee On A. M.

1866 The meeting was organized on Monday morning, after which the delegates from the churches reported themselves, and it was ascertained that one hundred and sixty-five churches were represented by two hundred delegates. The delegates were divided into fifteen sub-committees, and to these the business was committed, that they might report to the General Council. The General Council commenced business on Tuesday morning, after devotional exercises. The deferred business of last Annual Meeting being the first business in order before the council, the committee appointed at that meeting to devise some plan for holding our Annual Meetings, which will be more satisfactory to the brotherhood, was called upon for its report and submitted the following:

Introductory Remarks

The authority for holding general conference meetings is founded on the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and a strict compliance with the example therein is advisable. By reference to said Scripture, we learn that the question in dispute, and upon which the disciples differed, was not referred to a General Council until all efforts had failed to settle it in the church in which it originated. The following language occurs in the chapter above referred to: "When, therefore, Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain others of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." Here seems to be authority to send questions upon which the brethren differ in their judgments to a General Council, and that the bishops ought to go, and also to have certain others with them. It is further said: "And being brought on their way by the church, they passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the gentiles; and they caused great joy unto all the brethren." Here we see that those who were sent were brought on their way to the church. So should we do; that is, help such to go that we send. It is said further that "the apostles and elders came together to consider this matter." Hence we see that the Council Meeting should be for conference only.

The Annual Meeting

We recommend that the Annual Council be formed by the delegates sent by the district meetings, and by all the ordained elders present; that the meeting be held at the place designated by the council the preceding year, to commence on the first Tuesday after Whit Sunday, the previous Lord's-day (Whit Sunday) to be spent as it has hitherto been by the brethren in worship, at such places in the vicinity in which the meeting is to be held as shall be desired, and as may be judged most profitable; that there be no public meeting for worship where the council-meeting is held, though the meeting should be opened with devotional exercises, and the reading of the fifteenth chapter of Acts, and likewise closed with devotional exercises; that the meeting still be held alternately, in the east and in the west.

The District-Meetings

We recommend that each state form itself into convenient district-meetings. These meetings shall be formed by one or two representatives from each organized church, and we recommend that each church be represented in the district meeting, either by representatives or by letter. We think it best to hold those meetings in simplicity, and as much like the common council-meetings are held, as possible. A record of the district-meetings may be kept but not published. They should endeavor to settle all questions of a local character. But those of a general character, or those that concern the brotherhood in general, should be taken to the Annual Meeting. And all questions that can not be settled at the district-meetings should be taken to the Annual Meetings. In taking questions from the district to the Annual Meetings, they should be correctly and carefully formed; and all queries from district-meetings should be accompanied with an answer. But in case those meetings can not agree upon any question, then they shall be referred to the standing committee, and this shall form answers to the questions before they be read before the General Council. And it is considered very desirable, and indeed necessary, that in all cases in answering questions, both in district and Annual Meetings, that some Scripture authority or reason be given for the decision, though it should be done as briefly as possible.

No business can come before district meetings until it has passed through the church in which it originated. It is understood that any member falling under the counsel of the church, and being dissatisfied with the decision, may appeal to the Annual Meeting by presenting a petition, signed by a number of the members of the church. Nothing in this arrangement shall be so construed as to prevent any member from presenting himself before the standing committee of the Annual Meeting, to offer any thing that can not be brought before it in the manner prescribed, and the committee shall hear his case and dispose of it according to its judgment.

The church holding the meeting shall make arrangements to receive and entertain all the brethren and sisters privately. There shall be no boarding-tent put up at the place of meeting to entertain and feed a mixed multitude, as heretofore.

All churchs shall have the privilege to call on the General Council-meeting for committees to investigate grievances, and it shall be its duty to appoint such committees as heretofore.

The Organization of the Annual Meeting

The bishop and elders of the church holding the Annual Meeting shall select, from among the bishops present, the standing committee. Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, shall each be entitled to three, if present, and two, if present, from each of the remaining states in which churches are established, and whenever said states shall contain ten bishops each, they also shall be entitled to three. The standing committee shall choose its own officers, and these shall be a moderator, two clerks, and a door-keeper. It shall be the duty of the moderator to keep order among the members of the committee, and also in the public meeting. He shall not permit two brethren to speak at the same time, and he shall decide who is entitled to the floor. He shall also keep the speakers to the question, and declare the query passed, after general consent, by silence. It shall be the duty of the first clerk to keep a faithful record of all the queries and answers, and prepare them for publication. It shall be the duty of the second clerk to read distinctly all papers as often as requested. It shall be the duty of the door-keeper to take charge of the room in which the committee meet for business, and he shall allow no intrusion in time of session.

As soon as the standing committee has been named they shall retire to a private room for organization and the reception of the queries presented by the delegates from the district-meetings (or churches), after which all proper queries shall be read to the General Council-meeting for adoption or amendment, and sub-committees be dispensed with.

The proceedings of the Annual Meetings shall be published, and it is earnestly recommended that all the overseers of churches, whether ordained or not, have them faithfully read and observed in their respective charges. And if it be represented to the Annual Meeting that this recommendation is disregarded, it shall be the duty of the standing committee to appoint faithful brethren, whose duty it shall be to visit said churches, and see that the minutes are properly read and observed, and to set in order things that are lacking. The above is unanimously recommended to the Annual Meeting by the committee.

Signed by the committee: D. P. Saylor, Henry Koontz, of Maryland; Benjamin Moomaw, of Virginia; David Derrick, of Tennessee; John H. Umstad, John Wise, of Pennsylvania; H. D. Davy, James Quinter, John Hershey, of Ohio; Jacob Miller, Hiel Hamilton, of Indiana; Christian Long, John Bowman, of Illinois; David Brower, of Iowa.

Three members of the committee not being present, John Bowman, Henry Koontz, and James Quinter, were appointed to fill their places.

This report being read before the General Council, was adopted by the following resolution:

Resolved, That we try the committee's report for at least a sufficient length of time to give it a fair trial.

1871 ART. 4. Will this district-meeting approve of the following amendment to the plan of holding Annual Meetings: Let the districts send one delegate to represent them on the standing committee, and each congregation send one representative, and these to compose the Annual Meeting, and all queries to be decided by that body alone? Answer: We think it best not to make the change asked for, at present.

1871 ART. 28 Would it not be better to dispense with the district-meetings entirely, and go back to the plan of 1848, for holding the Annual Meeting? Answer: We think it best not to make the change asked for.

1872 ART. 16. Will not this meeting urge a change in holding our Annual Meeting, as the present system is very unsatisfactory? A reconsideration of Art. 4, of the last Annual Meeting is desired. Answer: This Annual Meeting readopts the answer of Art. 4, 1871.

1874 ART. 12. Would it not be better, and nearer the gospel and our profession, to have no stand and platform elevated at the place of holding our Annual Meeting, for the committee brethren and others of the meeting to sit and stand upon during the time of council? Answer: It is best to have no stand or platform in the Annual Council.

1874 ART. 13. The district-meeting of the middle district of Iowa, does sincerely ask the Annual Meeting of 1874 to prayerfully consider the propriety of making a change in the manner of holding our Annual Meeting. Answer: We do not consider it necessary to make any further change from the plan adopted by the Annual Meeting of 1868, than what has been already made; but we are deeply impressed, from our experience with the present meeting, of the propriety of adhering strictly to the order established at the Annual Meeting above referred to, and we want it further understood, that there shall be no provisions made for boarding at the meeting until Monday, the day before the commencement of the council.

1874 ART. 23. Will this Annual Meeting purchase the tent now in use by the brotherhood in holding the present meeting? Answer: Considered not advisable to do so.

1875 ART. 1. Should there not be some change made in the manner of holding our Annual Meetings? Answer: With regard to the expense of the meeting, we suggest, that as the rule with us is that the said meeting be held alternately east and west of the Ohio River, that, therefore, the expenses of the said Annual Meeting be defrayed by the respective divisions where held, upon some equitable mode, the congregation in which the meeting is held not to be required to contribute to said expense in money, the trouble incident to such a meeting to be considered their full portion of contribution.

The Annual Meeting, instead of adopting the above answer from the district-meeting, gave the following: We think it best to make no such change as asked for in the query at present.

1876 ART. 24. Whereas, a number of queries have come to this Annual Meeting relative to a change in the manner of holding said meeting; and, whereas, the changes proposed, though various, would not change the meeting very much from the present way in which it is held; and, whereas, the change proposed will not probably lessen to any very great extent the multitude in attendance; therefore, resolved, taking all things into consideration, that we make no general change, but will adhere as closely as possible to the plan adopted in 1866, and labor to lessen as much as possible the attendance at the meeting, and increae its facilities for business.

1877 ART. 23. There having been different papers presented to the Annual Meeting, both for and against a change in the manner of holding it, said papers were given into the hands of a committee, that made the following report, which was deferred:

To the Annual Meeting:—We, your committee, in pursuance of the duties assigned us to present some plan by which the conflicting sentiments of the brethren in reference to the manner of conducting the business of our Annual Meeting might be harmonized, submit the following: First, that whereas petitions were before us praying for a change, with plans submitted, and other remonstrating against a change, yet all together representing but a small portion of the brotherhood, we are not of the opinion that a material change is desirable. We therefore decide that no general change be made, but that some amendment may be made to advantage. We therefore submit the following: "That we would make no change in the organization or management of district meeting, other than we would earnestly recommend a greater effort by them to settle all local matters, according to the powers invested in them by the present plan, as laid down by Annual Meeting of 1866, and that all questions sent up to the Annual Meeting should be accompanied with an answer, if possible, and if not possible, and not of too grave importance, deferred for consideration until next district meeting." Second, that on the clause under the head of the organization of the Annual Meeting, with reference to the final disposition of questions, "And declare all queries passed after general consent is obtained," we would add, and if a decision can not be obtained in this way, it shall be decided by a vote of the Standing Committee and delegates present. In all other respects we recommend that the plan formed by Annual Meeting of 1866 be strictly adhered to, with such amendment as has since been passed by Annual Meeting, and not hold out any inducements for a mixed multitude to attend these meetings, because they are intended for business only. B. F. Moomaw, John P. Ebersole, Moses Miller, Jacob Berkey, D. E. Price.

1877 ART. 12. If a district of any state makes a request for the Annual Meeting, would it not be proper for the whole state to help bear the expenses, if requested to do so by said district? Answer: Yes, it is proper by their consent.

1878 ART. 1. The propriety or necessity of making a change in the manner of holding the Annual Meeting was the first subject presented to the meeting, as it had been deferred from the Annual Meeting of 1877. And there were also papers presented to the present meeting asking for a change, whereupon a motion to re-adopt the plan of 1866, with the amendments already made, for holding the Annual Meeting and for the appointment of a committee to devise a way to more effectually reduce or prevent the assembling of a mixed multitude, and for the carrying out more fully of the plan of 1866, was moved and carried. The committee is to report to the Annual Meeting of 1879, and the report is to be subject to any disposition the Annual Meeting may make of it. It was also resolved that the Standing Committee nominate said committee.

1879 ART. 1. As a committee had been appointed by the Annual Council of 1878 to devise a way to more effectually reduce or prevent the assembling of a mixed multitude, and for the carrying out more fully of the plan of 1866, and to report to the present meeting the result of their labors. This being unfinished or deferred business, it was the first in order to be acted upon, and accordingly the committee made the following report: The committee appointed by the Annual Meeting of 1878 for preparing and presenting to the Annual Meeting of 1879 some plan for holding the Annual Meeting by which that adopted in 1866 may be more fully carried out, and the mixed multitude reduced, met at the house of Brother Christian Wine on the 30th of May, 1879, in Rockingham County, Virginia, and, upon a prayerful deliberation of the work committed to us, have concluded to submit the following suggestions to this Annual Meeting: **First.** Inasmuch as there has been some difficulty in holding our Annual Meeting because of the amount of funds required to hold it, to obviate this difficulty, we recommended that each brother that attends the meeting shall pay one dollar; and though the sisters have nothing laid upon them, it is to be understood that they may do as they think proper in contributing to the support of the meeting. **Second.** We recommend that none but the brethren and sisters, and their special friends, shall receive their boarding in the general boarding tent; but that a tent, or if necessary or desirable more than one, be erected by reliable persons for accommodating such as are not members of the church with suitable boarding, and at a moderate price. And that this may be done, we recommand that the brethren have the oversight of all the boarding arrangements, and so fix them as will be most satisfactory to the church and to those for whose accommodations they are designed. **Third.** In order that a proper distinction may be made between such as are members and such as are not, we recommend that the members be furnished with tickets. These tickets shall be furnished by the proper authority at the place at which the meeting is to be held; and each church shall obtain from that authority as many tickets as shall be wanted by members going to Annual Meeting from that church. **Fourth.** The members of the church in which the meeting is held shall be exonerated from paying the amount that the others shall pay, and the committee of arrangements shall decide who are entitled to exoneration besides the congregation in which the meeting is held, for services rendered. **Fifth.** We recommend that the committee of arrangements acting for the church in which the meeting is held, shall decide whether there shall be any preaching at the place of meeting. **Sixth.** We recommend that good arrangements be made for the Standing Committee and delegates, and that the tent for holding the council be no larger than will contain as many as can hear what is spoken. We also recommend that it be a sufficient distance from the boarding tent, that the council may not be annoyed by any noise. We also suggest the propriety of so arranging the council tent that the seats may be elevated from the center; but the seats only, and not the platform for the Standing Committee and delegates. We further recommend that in making the boarding tent there be an aisle through the whole length of the tent, separating the brethren from the sisters; and that the tables run from the aisle to the side of the tent, and that there be a door in the side of the tent to each table for admitting the brethren on one side and the sisters on the other. All of which is respectfully submitted. R. H. Miller, J. Quinter, D. Brower, E. Eby, S. Garber. The above report was accepted by the council.

1880 ART. 4. Inasmuch as the Scriptures enjoin respect to the aged, (see Lev. xix 32; I. Tim. v. 1,) we ask the district meeting to petition Annual Meeting for our young official brethren, youthful editors, etc., to permit our aged brethren at Annual Meeting to occupy seats with and near the Standing Committee, where they have better opportunity to hear the proceedings, and also to give counsel. Answer: We think the young should do so.

1880 ART. 24. Will the meeting of the Middle District of Iowa remonstrate against any district meeting changing the time of holding Annual Meeting hereafter, for we favor the old-established time? The district meeting granted the above request. Answer: The following is the answer of the Annual Meeting: Let the Annual Meeting grant the liberty to change, if the change is wanted.

1881 ART. 13. Whereas, Annual Meeting is always a large assembly, and it is next to impossible to get anything like a definite vote from the whole assembly; and even if we could obtain a definite vote on every question from the whole assmbly, the decisions must necessarily partake of the sentiments of the district in which Annual Meeting is held, on account of the superior number of voters by which it is represented; and,

Whereas, The brotherhood can be evenly represented by delegates, and the work much more expeditiously and satisfactorily performed by confining the voting entirely to the delegates; therefore,

Resolved, That we pray Annual Meeting to make all her decisions by a majority vote of the delegates present. Answer: We decide to make no change.

1882 ART. 2. Would it not be advisable for the district meeting to petition or request Annual Meeting to adopt the plan for holding the Annual Meeting that was unanimously agreed upon by the old brethren in 1848, Article 29—instead of the present plan? And if thought advisable, then the Annual Meeting should, by committee or otherwise, adopt a uniform order for bringing all queries to the Annual Meeting, so that there could be no deception practiced on the old brethren. This meeting is willing that this query shall go to the Yearly meeting for the consideration of that body. Answer: Inasmuch as there are many requests presented to this Yearly Meeting for putting away the district meetings, and discovering that there is a very general desire to do so, we decide to adopt the plan of 1848—by making amendments thereto as may be thought expedient. The meeting therefore appoints the following five brethren as a committee for this purpose. Emanuel Hoover, of Ohio; Samuel Murray, of Ohio; A. H. Sensney, of Maryland; G. V. Siler, of Ohio; Abraham Miller, of Indiana. The committee convened at once and reported as follows:

1882 We, the committee, recommend that one or two messengers be sent from each local district to the Yearly Meeting, whose duty it shall be to select from their number seven elders by casting lots. The seven having the highest number shall constitute the Standing Committee, and the one receiving the highest number of votes shall serve as their foreman. This committee shall then choose, from their own number or others, one reading clerk, and one writing clerk. The committee shall receive all the papers and queries, and shall select from among the messengers as many sub committees as may be needful, and shall distribute to them the queries, who shall form answers to them in order to despatch the business. It shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to see that all the business is properly brought before the General Council. Any query pertaining to matters of doctrine or the general order of the church shall first pass through the church in which it originated, and shall be properly certified to, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. (Matthew xviii. 16) All matters of local character coming to the Yearly Meeting must be first considered by the local church, with the assistance of the adjoining elders, before it can be accepted. (See Annual Meeting in 1842, Article 5; 1852, Article 29; 1871, Article 13; and 1877, Article 13.) We also recommend having a communion in connection with the Yearly Meeting; but this is to be left to the option of the church wherein the meeting is held. The communion should be held on Saturday or Sunday evening previous to the council. This report was accepted.

1883 ART. 1. Would it not be more in accordance with the gospel and the ancient custom of the brethren to hold our Yearly Meeting more in common? Say, where the next Yearly Meeting will be held, let there be a committee of arrangements appointed, and let them appoint a brother who shall receive the contributions of the churches. Let him so publish it through the **Vindicator** or otherwise, then let all the churches give as the Lord has prospered them; this is to be a standing Yearly Meeting fund. Let each receiver hold over any funds in his hands until his successor is appointed. Then let him pay over to his successor the balance in his possession. Answer: We defer this query for conideration till next Yearly Meeting.

1883 ART. 3. We ask this Yearly Meeting to reconsider the answer of the second article of the minutes of last year and make the following change: First, let the elder or elders in the district where the Yearly Meeting is held, make the selection for the Standing Committee from among the elders present; then let the committee choose a brother to act as their foreman. The elder making this selection shall do so with a view that the states may generally be represented in the Standing Committee. Answer: This meeting is willing to change the answer of last year so far: Let the messengers select the Standing Committee, as was decided, but let the number be increased to twelve, and let the committee choose their own foreman.

1884 ART. 1. Inasmuch as query first of 1883 was deferred and to have more time for consideration, several requests from different churches came before the Standing Committee. The petition of the Appanoose Church, Kansas, was taken, as covering all others: "We, the brethren of Appanoose Church, Franklin County, Kansas, send greetings to the Brethren assembled in council at Beaverdam Church, Maryland," etc. "and also in reference to the raising of means for holding the Yearly Meeting, we think there should be no change made, and therefore pray Yearly Meeting to make no change," etc. Answer. This meeting grants the request, **to make no change.**

1898 ART. 5. Would it not be better to have all the states east of the Ohio River to hold the Annual Meeting together and defray the expenses of it, in the place of one State; and also all the States west of Ohio and Indiana hold the Annual Meeting the same way; also Ohio and Indiana hold the Annual Meeting, each State separate or together whenever it falls upon them to take the Annual Meeting? By so doing it would likely go oftener east and west than what it has in the past, so as to give all the members a better chance to get to the Annual Meeting. Answer. We grant the request herein asked for, and advise that the State of Michigan be included with the Western States. This answer is not to be construed to make it obligatory on either of the three districts to take the Annual Meeting by turn, but rather according to ability or obligation as to Christian duty.

1901 ART. 1. Will not this Annual Meeting advise our dear members not to grant any stand rights of any kind on their premises at our Annual Meeting, or at our communion meetings? Answer: We advise that brethren having control of grounds either at annual or communion meetings use all reasonable means in keeping such stands at such distance as not to disturb the meetings.

1909 ART. 6. For the standing committee to accept or reject after due consideration.

Inasmuch as our brotherhood is now supplied with canvas tents for the purpose of holding our annual councils, both East and West, as it may be thought good for all interested, and as our brotherhood is divided off into four parts or districts for the holding and defraying of the expenses, would it not be good for the cause and general interest of the members if these four districts could come to some understanding to hold the Annual Meeting alternately from East to West, so that it would be known from year to year where our council will be held, and thereby giving all concerned a better chance to prepare and make the necessary arrangements in due time, and for the general good of the poorer classes in our brotherhood? Submitted for consideration or amendment by the standing committee to Yearly Meeting for one year.

We, the standing committee, submit the above request to the general council for consideration through the churches and report to the Yearly Meeting of 1910.

Passed to go on the minutes for one year's consideration.

1923 ART. 1. First: Inasmuch as many of our dear members think it improper for members to own, operate or work in stands at our annual meetings, will, therefore, this annual meeting consider the impropriety of the same and say that members shall not do so? Second: We ask Annual Meeting of 1923 to decide not to permit any bottled drinks to be sold on our annual meeting grounds and also to advise any member not to engage in any form of merchandise at the time and on the grounds of annual meeting. Answer: As to the first part, we consider that members ought not to do so. As to the second part, relative to stand rights and sale of goods, see Article 1, minutes of A. M. 1900. The committee on arrangements has the right to prevent the sale of bottled goods or anything else objectionable. I Thess. 5:22. Passed.

1927 ART. 1. Past experience has proven that when the privilege is granted for some one to conduct a refreshment stand or stands on our Annual Meeting grounds, almost invariably the rules governing the manner in which such stands should be controlled have been ignored to the grantee, resulting in a "County Fair" condition, causing much unfavorable comment by the world and casting a shadow over the better light that should be manifested by the people of God when assembled together to consider the sacred principles that mean so much for the spiritual progress of the Church. Further: It seems contrary to Christ's teachings for a sacred assembly working for His cause, becoming an excuse for merchandising. See John 2:16. It is also reasonable to conclude especially under conditions of this kind that **fasting** is much more consistent than **feasting.**

In view of above reasons and more that might be given, we would ask that this Annual Meeting reconsider Art. 1, A. M. of 1900, also Art. 1, of A. M. of 1923, and conclude that from now on he upon whose premises these meetings are held (also others), should forfeit the right to let refreshment stands of any kind upon said premises.

(b) Inasmuch as the lunch stands at our Annual Meetings are being allowed more privileges, and are continually locating nearer the Meeting Tents; also being allowed to sell soft bottled drinks; all of which is becoming grevious to many of our members who feel these practices are not in harmony with our humble and non conforming profession, and the Scriptures; Therefore we earnestly pray this Annual Meeting to give its prayerful consideration to the above and especially to prohibit the sale of soft or bottled drinks; which, if indulged in by our beloved members, shows a very bad light to the world. See Matt. 5:16; also I Thess. 5:22. Answer: We reaffirm minutes of 1900 and 1923 with advice to the committee of arrangements to more fully adhere to said minutes. Passed with its answer.

1930 ART. 1. (1) Inasmuch as the A. M. district of Indiana now holds the A. M. twice to the Western Division once—and it being the smallest in membership—and the state of Michigan adjoining the same, we ask the A. M. of 1930 to attach the churches of Michigan to the Indiana district.

(2) Inasmuch as the churches of Michigan are close to the state of Indiana and it would therefore be more convenient for them to help the churches of Indiana with the labors of A. M. when held in Indiana, and inasmuch as Indiana with fewer members, holds the A. M. twice to the Western district once, will not the A. M. of 1930 release the Michigan members from the Western district and annex them to the district of Indiana? Answer: We agree to defer this question for one year, and recommend that the Western district be counseled upon it and report to the Annual Meeting of 1931.

1930 ART. 1. Deferred by the Annual Meeting of 1930.

(1) Inasmuch as the A. M. district of Indiana now holds the A. M. twice to the Western district once—and it being the smallest in membership —and the state of Michigan adjoining the same, we ask the A. M. of 1930 to attach the churches of Michigan to the Indiana district.

(2) Inasmuch as the churches of Michigan are close to the state of Indiana and it would therefore be more convenient for them to help the churches of Indiana with the labors of A. M. when held in Indiana, and inasmuch as Indiana with fewer members, holds the A. M. twice to the Western district once, will not the A. M. of 1930 release the Michigan members from the Western district and annex them to the district of Indiana?

Answer: We agree to defer this question for one year, and recommend that the Western district be counseled upon it and report to the Annual Meeting of 1931.

Answer: In accordance with the recommendation in the answer to the above queries, as passed by the A. M. of 1930, the churches of the Western District were counseled with reference to attaching the churches of Michigan to the District of Indiana. The counsel of said churches as reported, showed that a majority of them were not favorable to the proposed change, and this A. M. of 1931 decides to make no change. Passed.

1936 ART. 3. Inasmuch as the churches of Indiana have appealed to the A. M. different times to adopt some plan whereby the holding of A. M. might be made less expensive and burdensome for them than at present, and more equable with the larger membership of Ohio;

Therefore, we would recommend that the following plan for holding of A. M. in Indiana be adopted:

Instead of the District of Indiana holding the A. M. as often as the District of Ohio, we pray the A. M. of 1936 to decide to alternate said District of Indiana with the Eastern and Western Districts.

Answer of Sub-committee: We unanimously agree to propose that the churches of Michigan be annexed to those of Indiana instead of being joined to the Western District, and leave the rotation as it is at present.

Answer: Passed by the Meeting.

1848 ART. 10. Would it not be better, in selecting the representatives, or delegates, to the Yearly Meeting, to take them all from among the lay members, or lay brethren? Considered, to refer this, and all other questions on Yearly Meeting, to the committee of elders, to consider and report thereon.

1849 ART. 44. Would it not be more consistent with the simplicity of the gospel not to use the word "delegate," or "representative," in the minutes? Considered, that as words convey ideas, we should use such as shall best answer that purpose.

1857 ART. 5. When the churches send messengers to represent them in the Annual Council, should they not have their traveling expenses, to and from the place of meeting, defrayed by the churches which send them? Answer: Yes, they should, if they require it.

1857 ART. 24. Would it not be best for churches, in selecting delegates to represent them at the Annual Council, to make choice of one deacon, or of one lay member, to serve as a delegate in connection with one ministering brother, and thus relieve the ministry from the responsible position of being the exclusive advisers of the churches? Answer: We think it should be left to the churches to select such members for delegates as they may think proper.

1869 ART. 19. Could not the Annual Meeting, during its several sessions, arrange a little better for the accommodation of the delegates, sent from the different districts on business, by providing seats for them near the standing committee, it having been the case on former occasions that they were crowded out to the remotest bounds of the assembly to their great dissatisfaction? Answer: Considered that the committee of arrangements should provide a number of seats nearest to the standing committee, sufficient to seat all the delegates sent from districts.

1870 ART. 29. Inasmuch as the district-meetings have no regular order for appointing delegates to the Annual Meeting, we offer the following method to the brotherhood: Let three official members constitute a committee for receiving the votes of the delegates from the several churches comprising the district-meetings. The above plan for appointing delegates to the Annual Meeting was submitted by the standing committee and accepted by the General Council.

NOTE: See Art. 4, 1871. A. M. Manner of holding.

1875 ART. 4. This congregation petitions the district-meeting to petition the Annual Meeting for an amendment to the plan of holding the Annual Meeting, and proposes the following plan: Let each district-meeting send one delegate to form the standing committee, and each church to have the privilege of sending one or two delegates as a home representation, and these, in connection with the standing committee, to form the official body for the transaction of all business presented to the meeting for action. Answer: We think it best not to make the proposed change.

1875 ART. 5. Is it right for the standing committee to change the import of any query addressed to the Annual Meeting? Answer: It is not right to do so.

1875 ART. 10. Should not the delegate accompanying the member of the standing committee from each district, be admitted in with the standing committee of the Annual Meeting, during the examination of the business from the district which he represents? Answer: We conclude to make no change at the present.

1875 ART. 11. Are the delegates sent by the district-meeting to the Annual Meeting to represent the sentiments of the district which sends them, or have they the privilege to represent their own sentiments? Answer: They should represent the sentiments of their district.

1876 ART. 6. We ask for a reconsideration of Art. 11, of last year. Answer: We agree to reconsider the above query, and think that the delegate should first represent the sentiments of the district-meeting, but after doing so, should have the privilege of speaking his own sentiments.

NOTE: See Art. 13, 1881, A. M. Manner of Holding.

1881 ART. 17. Inasmuch as Annual Meeting of 1876, Article 8, forbids members who dress after the fashions of the world to speak in public at our conference, should not churches and district meetings be instructed to send only such delegates who dress themselves and wear their hair after the general order of the brotherhood, and who try to carry out this decision? Answer: Yes.

1898 ART. 3. Can the brethren give some method by which to send messengers to Annual Meetings, as some members think that they ought to be voted in instead of nominating them and then asking the members if they are satisfied to send the brethren nominated? Answer: We think it advisable to nominate messengers to be sent to Annual Meetings, then ask the church if they are satisfied to send them.

1921 ART. 3. Inasmuch as the local churches of our Brotherhood have several different methods for selecting the messengers to Yearly Meeting and as we have very little on the minutes in regard to this matter, will not this A. M. adopt the following plan so there may be only one way all over the Brotherhood; Let the two oldest in office be nominated, then let the church be counselled in their absence to see whether or not she is willing that they shall serve. After the church has selectd the two nominated, then let the next oldest in office be nominated and the church be counselled for him to serve in case one or both the others fail to go. If it should become known later that neither of these three will serve, then the church may be further counselled in regard to sending the brother next oldest in office; or if there be no other official, a lay brother, so that no brother may act as messenger who has not been sent by the counsel of the church. The brethren thus selected shall be under obligations to go unless a good reason can be given for not going. Answer: This Annual Meeting agrees that the two highest in office be nominated and the voice of the church taken in the absence of all the ministers with the understanding that if the two nominated can not go the next highest in office shall go, and shall so continue down to the deacons and lay members. Passed.

1927 ART. 9. Will this Annual Meeting say that hereafter it shall not be permissible for an elder or any brethren to come into the messenger room and object to or question the right of any messengers serving, who have the authority from their respective churches and against whom the adjoining elders have made no objections?

1931 ART. 3. We pray A. M. to reconsider Art. 3 of 1921 and grant that no brother shall serve as messenger to A. M. without the counsel of the church which he is to represent, said counsel to be taken in his absence.

Answer: We unanimously agree to make no change. Passed.

1932 ART. 1 Inasmuch as the peace and union of the Brotherhood depends largely upon the labors of the messengers that are sent to A. M.,

Therefore, we pray this Annual Meeting to reconsider former minutes on the messenger question and recommend the adoption of the following method for selecting messengers to represent the local districts at Annual Meeting.

(1st) Local churches should be careful to select competent brethren, well established in the faith and in good standing.

(2nd) In all cases consider brethren most advanced in office, first, or give them preference.

(3rd) Only one brother at a time withdraw from the council, in order to be considered by the voice of the church, or take the voice of the church in a private way.

(4th) Each church district to be entitled to send two messengers; but if failing to send two owing to circumstances, one will do.

(5th) No brother to serve as a messenger without the authority from his local district.

Answer: Passed.

1934 ART. 9. Inasmuch as the minutes of 1932, Art. 1, gives much dissatisfaction in regard to selecting messengers to represent the local districts at Annual Meeting, setting forth two methods, giving cause that as many as three ways have been used. We therefore pray this A. M. to readopt the answer to the minutes of 1921, Art. 3.

Answer: Deferred for one year.

1935 ART. 5. Is it the duty of a church to consider an elder in charge, having his membership in another church, in preference to their own officials when choosing a messenger to represent the local church at A. M.?

Answer: No. Passed.

Queries

1842 ART. 5. Whether the queries to be submitted to the yearly meeting should not be laid first before the individual church, and be sent with their consent? Considered, that queries in relation to a particular church ought to be brought in with the counsel of that church, but a brother should not be prevented thereby to present any question that may occur unto him as important and necessary to be considered.

1846 ART. 2. Whether any individual member has a right to bring queries before the Yearly Meeting ere they have passed the council of the church? Considered, that it is proper to bring all queries with the counsel of the church.

1850 ART. 22. Whether the committee could not be selected, and the questions taken in, at our Annual Meetings, on Saturday, as well as Monday? Considered, to leave it as it is at present.

1852 ART. 29. The following was also proposed and adopted: This meeting would advise, that every church, before the time of the Annual Meeting, should take counsel, and select brethren to represent them in Annual Meeting, and also counsel whether they have any thing to send, and if so, that they pass the counsel of the church, and put every question on a paper by itself, and state from what church, and sign it, and fold it, and write on the back of it briefly what the question is. Thus it should be handed in or sent by mail. Brethren who would bring questions otherwise than in the above way, should come before the committee, and state the question, and the reason why they could not counsel the church, else the question can not be received. (The object of this is chiefly to concentrate the business of the meeting, which otherwise could not be gone through in as short a time as two or three days).

1853 ART. 2. Whether it is necessary to abide by the twenty-ninth article of last year's minutes, with regard to indorsing the letters of the outside, whether they contained queries or not? Concluded, unanimously, that this article be so altered that only the word query, and how many queries? be indorsed on the outside.

1854 ART. 25. Whether the 29th article of the Minutes of 1852 should not be readopted? Considered, to let it remain as decided last year (Art. 2), with the understanding that each query should be written on a separate paper.

1862 ART. 71. Resolved, by this council-meeting, that no query shall be presented to the Annual Conference without being signed by the elders, in the name of the church in which it originates.

1874 ART. 7. This district-meeting petitions the Annual Meeting to grant to district-meetings the privilege of sending to the Annual Meeting queries and petitions that may originate during their sessions. Answer: Considered best not to grant the right to do so.

1875 ART. 4. This congregation petitions the district-meeting to petition the Annual Meeting for an amendment to the plan of holding the Annual Meeting, and proposes the following plan: Let each district-meeting send one delegate to form the standing committee, and each church to have the privilege of sending one or two delegates as a home representative, and these, in connection with the standing committee, to form the official body for the transaction of all busineses presented to the meeting for action. Answer: We think it best not to make the proposed change.

1876 ART. 4. Is it right to reject all queries coming before the Annual Meeting, simply because they do not contain a proviso to repeal all other queries previously passed by Annual Meetings, which may conflict with the last one presented? Answer: While we do not think it always necessary, in a formal manner, to reconsider a former query before another answer to the query is made, nevertheless, we consider it best to refer to former decisions, and have it understood that such decisions are void when they conflict with the last decision.

1877 ART. 4. When a query is sent requiring a definite answer, have the delegates the power to withdraw it? Answer: Delegates have no authority to withdraw any query sent through them to Annual Meeting.

1881 ART. 2. We request Annual Meeting to permit the elders present not belonging to the Standing Committee to open the meeting in their absence after their first meeting, and thus relieve them of much labor. Answer: We believe it would be proper for any elder or brethren to open the meeting with devotional exercises, but we think the Standing Committee should be present.

1883 ART. 4. We petition the brethren assembled in annual council to consider the propriety of sending back all queries of a local nature, after they have been answered by the Scriptures, and the best advice given how to settle said local trouble. Then place said query with its answer or advice in the hands of the messengers who brought the query, and let the church act on that advice. And those queries and answers not to be put on the minutes. We think this plan would be more apostolic, and would stop the fast accumulation of our minutes. Answer: This Yearly Meeting adopts the above petition.

1905 ART. 3. Would it not be advisable when reading queries to be considered at our annual councils to read such queries only in connection with the location where they originated so that all may know where they come from, since we are all brethren of one common family in Christ. Answer: This Yearly Meeting says all queries should be located when read at Yearly Meeting.

1908 ART. 2. Two queries were presented to this Yearly Meeting asking that all queries presented to the local churches, intended for the consideration of Yearly Meeting, be first considered by the official council the same as all other local church work should be. Answer: Yes, all queries that are to be presented at Yearly Meeting should first be considered by the official council of the local church.

1910 ART. 3. Inasmuch as the decision, article 2, of 1908, is causing so much dissatisfaction and confusion, some claiming that official council could, in different ways, without a query from coming before the church, should they so desire, will not this Yearly Meeting reconsider said decision and so frame an answer that while going through the private council, it must also go before the church, as the power lies in the church and not in the private council? Answer: We, your sub-committee, unitedly agree to make no change in minute, article No. 2, 1908. As all church work is considered by private council, to prepare it for public council, and if any query should come into private council not in fit shape for public council, we think the private council, with the originator, have a right to quiet it in private council. Passed by the meeting.

1910 ART. 5. Since it frequently occurs at our Yearly Meeting some brethren (sometimes several of them) who do not understand the design or purpose of the query, rise up and talk on the query, quite contrary to the design, object, or purpose of the query, thus confusing the minds of the meeting. Therefore we request Yearly Meeting of 1910 to decide that in the future no brother shall be allowed to speak on a query before the messenger (if present) from the district from whence the query came shall have an opportunity to explain the design, object or purpose of the query. Answer: Yes, we, your sub-committee, feel to grant the request called for in the quiry, and advise that no brother speak till the messenger, if present, explains the design or purpose of the query, if not understood. Passed by the meeting.

Rules Governing

1857 ART. 21. Would it not be better, in deciding upon all subjects brought before our Annual Meeting, to refer first to the word of God, instead of first referring to the old minutes? Answer: We think it always safest to refer first to the word of God.

1876 ART. 1. Whereas, there seems to be a disposition on the part of some of our brethren to consume much time on many of the queries that come before our Annual Meeting, and some even become very personal in their remarks; and, whereas, this has caused hard feelings, and severe censure; be it therefore resolved, that the following rules be adopted for the government of our Annual Meetings in the transaction of its business: 1. All queries for discussion, with their answers, shall be read by the clerk, after which the moderator shall declare the same open for discussion. 2. The reading of any question may be called for the second time, but not oftener if there be objections made. No brother shall have the privilege of making more than two speeches on the same subject, except by the consent of the meeting, and the first shall not be longer than fifteen, and the last than five minutes. 4. The moderator shall require every brother, when speaking, to confine his remarks to the subject before the meeting. 5. Any brother using personalities in his speech, shall be called to order by the moderator; and if he persist, he shall be told to take his seat. 6. The moderator shall decide who has the right to the floor, and when his time expires. 7. The moderator shall decide when the discussion on each subject shall close, and when the question shall be put on its final passage. But if objection be made to his ruling, then the standing committee must unite with him in deciding the matter. 8. It shall be the duty of the moderator to keep order in the congregation; and for this purpose he may call to his assistance other brethren, or the standing committee may call on brethren to keep order.

All former rules not in conflict with the foregoing shall continue in force.

1877 ART. 25. We, the brethren and sisters of Barren Ridge, would ask the district meeting of Virginia, No. 2, and Annual Meeting, to favor us with a frequent change in moderators and clerks, as it is thought it would give better satisfaction to both district and Annual Meeting to do so. This district approves of the above-named change, and asks the sanction of the Annual Meeting. Answer. This Annual Meeting sanctions the change.

1880 ART. 1. Whereas, the progress of the Annual Meeting of 1879 was unnecessarily delayed by the opposition of one elder to an answer, to the dissatisfaction of many, we ask this district meeting to ask Annual Meeting to require a very small minority to yield to a very large majority in the Annual Meeting, and also in our common council meeting. Answer: Granted· unless it would be in cases where the majority would attempt a departure from the word of God and the general order of the brotherhood.

1910 ART. 4. Inasmuch as there was considerable dissatisfaction caused, which is still existing, relative to the way query No. 7 of the minutes of Yearly Meeting of 1909 was answered.

Therefore, we request Yearly Meeting of 1910 to reconsider the answer as given to query No. 7 by Yearly Meeting of 1909, and instead of the present answer as it stands on the minutes of Yearly Meeting of 1909, say that in the future the messengers be instructed to act more in accordance with the request as set forth in query No. 7, of minutes of Yearly Meeting of 1909. Answer: We, your sub-committee, after due consideration would advise that the messengers be admonished by the former standing committee to be guided by the Spirit in making choice of elders to serve on the standing committee, as members are admonished in making choice of other officers of the church. This to serve as the answer to the minute referred to above. Passed by the meeting.

1937 ART. 5. Inasmuch as it has always been the order of the Old Brethren to settle everything that comes before A. M. by the unanimity rule, will not this A. M. recommend that we stay more closely to the practice of the fathers and not allow a rising vote as was done at last year's A. M.?

Answer: We unanimously agree to grant the request of this query. Passed by the meeting.

Decisions

1805 ART. 2. Further, it has been considered, that when there is made a conclusion at the big yearly meeting, and there are members who would not heed, nor conduct themselves accordingly, it has been concluded unitedly, that when such persons can not convince the church by evidence from holy Scripture, and would or did rise up against said church conclusion, would not hear or obey at all, in such case we could not well do otherwise, but after sufficient and friendly admonition, to set them back from the breaking of bread until they learn to do better and become obedient.

1848 ART. 13. Whether it would be expedient, or not, to bring the question from the Yearly Meeting to each church, anl let them consider them, and at the next Yearly Meeting, let the decision of each respective church be made known? Considered, that it would not be expedient so to do, as it would be the means of accumulating the amount of business.

1848 ART. 25. Ought not those queries which stand upon the minutes of 1846, and were considered and decided by the elders in private committee, instead of public counsel, be repealed? The fact was stated, by impartial witnesses, that the council-meeting was broken up prematurely, on account of the multitude gathering in on Saturday, so that the elders had to adjourn to a private room, in order that they might give, as they were requested, their sense on queries yet on docket. These queries were read, with the answers given before this Yearly Meeting, and all were approved of, almost without a dissenting voice.

1849 ART. 8. Would it not be right for the brethren, in council at the Annual Meeting, to appoint several brethren that are experienced and sound in the faith, and send them, two and two, with the decisions of the Annual Meeting, and let them visit with all the congregations in the United States, and establish them all in the same order, according to example (Acts xv.)? Considered, to leave this over for further consideration.

1850 ART. 5. Whether it is right for brethren, in different arms of the church, to go against the counsel of the Yearly Meeting? Considered, that it is wrong for brethren to go against the counsel of our great Annual Meetings. But should brethren not be satisfied with said counsel, they have liberty, with the consent of their church, to bring the matter before another Yearly Meeting, for a reconsideration.

1858 ART. 22. What should be done with a brother who holds the council of the Annual Meeting in disrespect, and who speaks lightly and disrespectfully of it? Considered, that he should be kindly admonished to do so no more, and if he will not hear the admonition, he should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1858 ART. 27. Would it not be well for the brethren to come upon some plan to acquaint all the bishops and housekeepers of the various branches of the church with the rules and regulations concluded upon by the General Council for the more perfect union and prosperity of the church? And if these rules and regulations be violated by a minister, with some of the members composing his district, should they not fall into the hands of the brethren of the adjacent districts, as offenders, and be dealt with as such; and if the above should be considered expedient, what plan would be devised to carry it into effect? Answer: We are fully satisfied that the means long had in practice by the brethren (namely, the minutes of our Annual Meeting), are sufficient to give the teachers and housekeepers, and members in general, the decisions of our Annual Council for the perfecting of love and union throughout the brotherhood; and if it should so happen that a housekeeper, with a part, or all, of the membership of his district, could not be satisfied with the decisions of the Annual Council, as we were advised and instructed by our beloved elder brethren, and unanimously concurred in at the Annual Meeting, held in 1850, in Montgomery County, Ohio, they should bear with the Annual Council, and with one another, until the next Annual Meeting, and then bring their grievances to the Annual Council where they proceeded from, and, we believe, full satisfaction will be obtained.

1858 ART. 44. Is the gospel itself sufficient to preserve a union of practice throughout the brotherhood? Considered, that the gospel, with the practice or order consistent with the gospel, will preserve the union of the brotherhood.

1860 ART. 1. Inasmuch as we publicly denounce (human) church discipline, and claim the New Testament Scriptures as the only rule of our faith and practice, is it, then, consistent with our profession to make a strict observance of the minutes of the Annual Council a test of fellowship? Answer: The decisions of the Annual Meeting are obligatory until such decisions shall be repealed by the same authority.

1865 ART. 22. As the decisions of the Annual Meeting, are not obeyed by all the overseers of the church, would it not be better to district the churches, and extend to those the power to return to the standing committee all those who fail to carry out the advice of the Annual Council? Answer: Yes.

1865 ART. 34. Does the Annual Council make laws, or give advice only, in cases where it has no direct gospel on the subject? Answer: It gives advice only.

1871 ART. 26. Is there not some way of bringing members to an account, who speak disrespectfully of and disregard the counsels of the Annual Meeting, and district and sub-district-meetings? Answer: Such members should be admonished, and if they will not hear, they should be dealt with as transgressors. (See, also, Minutes of 1866, and a paragraph under the heading, "The Organization of the Annual Meeting.")

1871 ART. 35. According to Art. 14, in minutes of 1869, can the church tolerate a brother who assails the Annual Meeting by writing against its decisions in the periodicals of the brotherhood? Answer: We think it is wrong for a brother to do so, and any doing it should make satisfaction to the church.

1879 ART. 21. Inasmuch as members shall not be expelled without gospel authority (see minutes, 1872, Article 1, and 1865, Art. 34), what shall be done with elders and officers of a church or a church itself, where members have been, and are being expelled in violation of the above decision; and what course shall such expelled members pursue in order to have their cases heard, and to have justice done them? Answer: They should call on the adjoining elders, and if they can not get justice that way, then they should call for a committee from the Annual Meeting.

1880 ART. 18. We request Annual Meeting, through district meeting, to reconsider Article 8, of minutes of 1849, and Article 18, 1851; also, last clause of committee's report, minutes, page 306; and if those brethren appointed can not succeed in setting things in order according to the minutes of Annual Meeting, they should report such members or churches to Annual Meeting, who shall send a committee of faithful brethren, with authority to deal with them according to Matthew xviii. 17.

The General Council passed the following resolution as an answer to the above request:

WHEREAS, There is a considerable difference among the brethren regarding the propriety of observing the dcisions of Annual Meeting; therefore,

Resolved, That all the brethren should labor, as far as they can, to observe the decisions of the Annual Meeting, and that the officers of the churches should labor carefully and judiciously to have the churches to carry them out until they are changed, if a change is desirable, and will bring us nearer the gospel. In the above we have reference to decisions that pertain to the present condition and circumstances of the church, and not to those that time and circumstances have made obsolete.

1905 ART. 1. Inasmuch as of late years there is an apparent departure from the ancient ruling of our old brethren in Annual Meeting by way of giving answers to queries and calling said answers merely advice, thereby losing the power and binding effect in the local churches where the difficulties exist and from whence the queries are sent for higher council, will not this Yearly Meeting readopt and reprint in this answer the minutes of 1860, Article 1, so that all the members may regard those decisions as binding upon the local churches according to the word of the Lord? See Matt. 16, 19; 18, 18; Jno. 20. 23; Acts 15. 28, 29. Answer: This Yearly Meeting grants the request of the query and readopts the answer to Article 1, 1860, which reads as follows: The decisions of the Annual Meeting are obligatory until such decisions shall be repealed by the same authority.

1905 ART. 4. Inasmuch as there is a great deal of dissatisfaction and grievance in the brotherhood, because Yearly Meeting is disrespected, by not adhering to the advices of Yearly Meeting, we therefore pray Yearly Meeting of 1905 to readopt and so recommend to our brotherhood, the conclusions of our forefathers at Yearly Meeting of 1805, article 2, which reads as follows: "It has been considered that when there is made a conclusion at the big Yearly Meeting and there are members who would not heed nor conduct themselves accordingly it has been concluded unitedly that when such persons can not convince the church by evidence from Holy Scripture, and would or did rise up against said church conclusion, would not hear or obey at all, in such case we could not well do otherwise, but after sufficient and friendly admonition, to set them back from the breaking of bread until they learn to do better and become obedient." Answer: This Yearly Meeting readopts the query of 1805, article 2, with the following amendment: That the Yearly Meeting shall be more careful so as not to pass decisions without Gospel authority. Rev. 22. 18, 19.

1909 ART. 1. Inasmuch as union was the object of the Old Brethren in the separation. They said in one of their petitions, our plain decisions have been disrespected and overruled, and if this state of things shall continue to exist we will lose all our power in the controlling of the church." Therefore, what must be done now with such elders and congregations that disregard the decisions of our Yearly Meeting. Answer: The councils of the Yearly Meeting are designed to keep the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace," and we therefore admonish all elders and congregations to respect her (the Yearly Meeting's counsels) until such time when she can unitedly see wherein she erred in giving counsel. Passed by the meeting.

1914 ART. 2. What should be done with elders and members who do not respect the counsels of Yearly Meetings, neither the resolutions of 1881, thereby causing confusion and divisions amongst us? Answer: We, your sub-committee, would refer this query back to the church from whence it came and advise the use of the decisions of Yearly Meeting of 1865, articles 17 and 18, and Yearly Meeting of 1909, article 1. Passed.

1940 ART. 8. Inasmuch as there was passed in 1865, Art. 34, the following: "Does the Annual Council make laws, or give advice only, in cases where it has no direct gospel on the subject? Answer: It gives advice only." And again, in 1872 at the Annual Meeting there was passed the following: Art. 5, 1872: "Is the gospel a perfect law to govern the church in all things necessary to salvation? Answer: It is."

Are the above decisions in effect today that were passed by the old fathers, according to the spirit of the Gospel?

Answer: We agree to reaffirm the minute of 1905, Art. 1. Passed.

Minutes

1848 ART. 17. With regard to the printing of the minutes of the Yearly Meetings, it was concluded to have as many printed, as to supply each church with two copies, but that on no condition they should be sold to such as are not members.

1849 ART. 6. An objection alleged against the printing of so few of the Minutes of the Yearly Meeting; would it not be expedient to have a greater number printed? Postponed the consideration of this to another query of like import. (See Art. 43.)

1849 ART. 7. An objection alleged against the printing of so few of the Minutes of the Yearly Meeting; would it not be expedient to have a greater number printed? Postponed the consideration of this to another query of like import. (See Art. 43.)

1849 ART. 43. Whether each elder, teacher, and visiting brother, should not have the privilege of having a copy of the minutes of the Yearly Meeting? Considered, that we are in favor for each ministering brother to have a copy, and that they be advised to keep them, if possible, from coming before the world; and we should further recommend, that they should be sent sealed, as we have known them to be opened in post-offices.

1850 ART. 2. How it is considered, inasmuch as our beloved brother, Henry Kurtz, is not present at this meeting, for to appoint a committee, to have the minutes of this meeting printed, and to receive all moneys appropriated to defray the expenses of printing? It has been agreed upon, by this meeting, that Bro. Benjamin Bowman, of Virginia, Daniel Summer of Ohio, and David Hardman, of Indiana, be this committee.

1852 ART. 5. Respecting the publication of the names of the special committees in the minutes, it was considered advisable not to insert so many names.

1852 ART. 6. Whether it would not be advisable to read the proceedings of the meeting at the conclusion of the same meeting? Considered, unnecessary, inasmuch as they are read again and again, one by one. But that the elders of each district should procure a copy of the proceedings of the Annual Meeting, and have the same read before their respective churches, and preserve the same for reference.

1857 ART. 23. If persons, who are not members of the church become subscribers to the "Gospel Visitor," should the editors send the minutes of the Annual Meeting to such? Answer: We think it not wrong to send the minutes of the Annual Meeting to all who desire them, and pay for them.

1858 ART. 14. Would it not be advisable for those who wish to have the minutes, to pay a few more cents to the publishers and have them sent in a sealed letter, more privately than they heretofore have been sent? Referred to the Annual Meeting of 1857. (We think it not wrong to send the minutes of the Annual Meeting to all who desire them and pay for them. Minutes of 1857, Art. 23.)

1858 ART. 55. Would it not be well for the standing committee of this Yearly Meeting to appoint a number of intelligent and pious brethren to collect all the minutes that can be obtained of our Yearly Meetings and have them printed in a volume for the use and satisfaction of the churches? Considered, we think it not advisable to do so.

1861 ART. 6. Will this Yearly Meeting grant the privilege to reprint all the minutes of the Yearly Meetings, so that those wishing to have them may have a full copy? Resolved, by this Annual Meeting, that this subject should be attended to, and we therefore recommend that a committee be appointed to gather up all the minutes, as far back as can be had, and bring them together in such a way and form as may be thought best, and we hereby appoint brethren Henry Kurtz, of Ohio, Andrew Spanogle, of Pennsylvania, John Kline, of Virginia, Christian Long, of Illinois, and Philip Boyle, of Maryland, to attend to said business, and report to next Yearly Meeting.

1863 ART. 24. Would it not be for the better to have the minutes of the Annual Meeting in the "Visitor" once a year, provided the editors were willing? Considered not advisable to have the minutes printed in the "Visitor."

1865 ART. 9. Whereas, the brethren have heretofore advised against publishing the proceedings of the Annual Meeting in the "Gospel Visitor," will they still disapprove of publishing them in our papers? Answer: We think the minutes of the Annual Meeting had better be kept separate from our public papers.

1870 ART. 1. Should not a full report of questions and answers passed by the Annual Meeting be given, instead of merely referring to former decisions? Answer: We think a full report of the answers should be put into the minutes when they are not too long.

1871 ART. 30. Inasmuch as the brethren are misrepresented and abused by enemies, saying the Brethren's Encyclopedia is our discipline, kept secret by a few leading brethren, would it not be better to advise the publisher to have no more bound?

Answer: We do not recognize the Brethren's Encyclopedia to be a discipline of the church, but we consider the reasons given in the query insufficient for making any change in regard to publishing it.

1873 ART. 24. Inasmuch as there are constant additions to the church and to the ministry of young brethren who are desirous to learn the proceedings of our Annual Meetings, would it not be advisable to publish, in pamphlet form, all the minutes of Annual Meetings since the last date of those contained in the Encyclopedia, including also those not published in this Encyclopedia, previous to said date, and have said pamphlet arranged so as to admit subsequent minutes. Answer: We think it best to defer this question.

1874 ART. 3. The eastern district of Maryland humbly asks the Annual Meeting to pass Art. 24, of the minutes of 1873, and appoint a committee to attend to said business. Answer: The request is granted.

1875 ART. 35. The committee appointed by the Annual Meeting of 1874, to collect the minutes of former Annual Meetings, held since the Brethren's Encyclopedia was published, finding a wish among the brethren to have the minutes omitted in the Encyclopedia published, as well as those passed by Annual Meetings since that work was published, have delayed our work until the Annual Meeting gives us further instruction. Shall we, then, publish all the minutes of Annual Meetings that can be collected, or only those passed by the Annual Meetings since the publication of the Brethren's Encyclopedia? Answer: Let all be published, and the work be called, "Minutes of Annual Councils."

1884 ART. 4. Will this Yearly Meeting approve of **re-publishing the Book of Minutes, with the additional minutes from 1876 to 1884,** such a number to meet the demand, and so **preserve** the counsels of our dear old Brethren, for the use of the Old German Baptist Church, and, if advisable, appoint some brethren to attend to the publishing and selling the same? Answer: Yes; just as soon as a sufficient demand is made known to bear all **expenses.** This Yearly Meeting appoints Brethren H. D. Davy, Samuel Murray, and Joseph I. Cover to see to the work.

1885 ART. 1. We, your committee appointed last year at the Yearly Meeting, held at Beaverdam Church, Carroll County, Maryland, for the re-publishing of the Book of the Minutes of the Annual Meeting, do state that we made frequent inquiries for the stereotype plates of said book, commencing in the month of August, 1884; and after the fourth inquiry, and search was made in the rooms of the "Christian Publishing House," Dayton, Ohio, the stereotype plates were found to be in tolerably good condition. Three were fractured, two damaged, and some five or six supposed to be missing. But owing to the fact that there was a joint partnership existing with the former publishers (Elders H. D. Davy and James Quinter) of the first edition of the book, 1876, and further, also, from the fact that these two brethren, as publishers, now stand identified in two distinct and separate organizations, having respectively and conventionally adopted ecclesiastical names, indicative of the peculiarity of their faith and church policy, as has been entered upon the minutes of the Old German Baptist Church for the year 1883 [see minutes of Wolf Creek meeting, May 29-31, 1882, Section 20, revised minutes], and upon the other part by Annual Meeting of 1883, has been entered upon their minutes the appellation of "The German Baptists," [see minutes of 1883, Bismarck], to which Elder James Quinter holds his membership. Consequently, as there was not that reciprocal feeling manifested toward the Old German Baptist brethren that formerly was accorded them, on account of the same doctrine, rule of government, faith, and practice, in a peaceful fellowship, we, your committee, could not proceed to publish the book assigned to us until the following difficulties were obviated:

First, Its copyright being in two proprietories, of diverse and singular control now in these two representatives of the two organizations whose interests would have to be consolidated by amicable consent, or by purchase or sale of the said right unto one or the other in agreement, but recently has resulted in Elder James Quinter selling all his right, title and interest, and claim, whatsoever, by conveyance from him and for them unto **us,** and **in behalf of you,** as an organization of the other part, before we could legally effect the bringing of the book (in question) before this meeting, as you desired. But we are now prepared to make you the following statement: Brother H. D. Davy has succeeded, by letters written by the other members of your committee, to have and to hold all the property in full, partly once the property of Elder James Quinter, for the sum of fifty dollars, fully paid by him, as per receipt of contract and assignment, dated March 3d, A. D. 1885, and set in his own hand and seal, and acknowledged the same in accordance to the law of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which see deed (A).

Secondly, Bro. H. D. Davy is out of and back, from the former publication about $350, namely, stationery, postage, labor in preparing the minutes, loss by agents, and cost of copyright and stereotypes, etc, which he now offers to sell and convey unto the Old German Baptist Church all his right, title, interest, and claim whatsoever, for the sum of $300, dropping fifty dollars in good will to the church, and making a clear title and assignment to the ordained elders of the Old German Baptist Church, and to their successors in office forever; they giving, through their authorized agents, an approved note for the term of three years, with interest at six per cent, from date of contract, interest paid annually, or at which time they shall have received a guarantee subscription or funds, in the hands of the churches, or **from the cash sale of the books to cover note, etc.**

Thirdly, This claim and title covers the publication of the Book of the Minutes of the Annual Meeting from the year 1778 to 1876, inclusive.

Fourthly, Brother H. D. Davy now being a party of the purchase and sale, his ability to act in this matter by the disposition of his own will voluntarily, while in said committee, ceases, and we further pray relief, or further instruction to complete the work assigned us.

H. D. Davy, Sam'l Murray, and Jos. I. Cover, committee.

COMMENDATORY.—From the Standing Committee

We recommend to this meeting that this business be continued and go on with the publishing of the book of "The Minutes of Annual Meeting," at an early date; and therefore, it now becomes necessary for this meeting to appoint two brethren competent to transact this business legally, according to the order of the Brethren, and for the church above named, and who shall have authority to act as the **Agents** of the Ordained Elders of the Old German Baptist Church, and thus transact the business in the contract now to be made, and to act in behalf of the church at large, to give note, sign it in behalf of the ordained elders of the church, and pay off the note, to receive the title and hold it in good faith from the said H. D. Davy, to publish the said book in a durable form, to take subscriptions for it, colleect in the same and all moneys accruing therefrom, and also to sell the same or anything pertaining thereto. Last, we suggest the appointment of Brothers Samuel Murray and Joseph I. Cover as corporate agents to carry out the furtherance of this noble work and publish the old book purchased from Bro. H. D. Davy, and with it the succeeding minutes from 1876 to this present meeting. Subject to approval of this meeting.

Approved by the meeting, with the understanding that subsequent minutes be also controlled by the copyright.

Signed in behalf of the Standing Committee: Abraham Flory, foreman; Aaron Frantz, reading clerk; Samuel Murray, assistant; Joseph I. Cover, clerk.

1903 ART. 3. Inasmuch as the Brotherhood is interested in hearing what business comes to our A. M. every year and is considered (See Art. 6, But sometimes matters of importance have been omitted),

Therefore, will not this Annual Meeting say that all queries and their sub-committees' answers, also all reports and petitions with their disposition by A. M. be printed in full in the yearly minutes circular that is printed so that our isolated and aged members and those who are unable to attend A. M. may be edified? But with the letters of greeting, all being of the same nature and spirit, only the district where from need be stated.

Answer: We unanimously agree to make no change. Passed.

1903 ART. 5. A request that the minutes of Yearly Meetings from the close of the minute book to the year A. D. 1904, inclusive, be consolidated in one pamphlet for the convenience of those who wish to preserve them. The request was granted and Brother Aaron Frantz was named to see to the work.

1908 ART. 6. To the brethren in Yearly Meeting assembled: Will not this meeting grant that a full report of all queries coming before these meetings, together with the disposition made of the same, be published in the minutes of said meetings for the satisfaction of those of our members who from various causes are not permitted to attend the meetings from time to time, thereby awakening a greater interest in the cause, as well as keeping the general brotherhood more forcibly impressed with the principles of the church as held by the Old Brethren? Answer: This Yearly Meeting grants the above request.

1910 ART. 1. Inasmuch as the supply of minutes of Yearly Meeting seems to be exhausted, we therefore request that an edition be printed embracing all the minutes from the close of the minute book to the year of 1910, inclusive, and consolidated in one pamphlet for the convenience of those who wish to preserve them. Answer: We, your sub-committee, decide to grant the request of the above query. Passed by the meeting.

1916 We, the members of the North Fork Church, Carroll County, Indiana, petition Annual Meeting of 1916 to formulate some plan to have another edition of the minute book published to include all minutes up to the present as all former editions are exhausted; and there are a number of young brethren and some older ones, that would like to have minute books but cannot get them.

Answer: Petition granted and Brethren J. M. Kimmel, Wm. N. Kinsey, and David Onkst appointed to get minute book printed.

1930 We the Standing Committee of 1930 feel the need of collecting the minutes of the Annual Meetings held since the publication of the Minute Book in 1917, and of publishing the same, including the minutes of the present meeting (1930), in a collected form. We ask A. M. to grant the above.

Request granted by the Annual Meeting.

1934 ART. 5. We pray this A. M. to grant that nothing be printed on the minutes of A. M. concerning answers to queries, decisions reached, as a committee's report or sending a committee, or any other matter that might tend to affect or disturb a district or the Brotherhood unless it first be endorsed and ratified by the Brotherhood and noted down by the writing clerk.

Answer: We unitedly agree to grant the request and say that all conclusions of Yearly Meeting shall be written down by the writing clerk and read before the open council before they are printed on the minutes. Passed.

1940 To the Standing Committee of the A. M. of 1940, Greetings: I have an index for the minutes of A. M. 1778 to 1939 including also the Resolutions of 1881, which I desire to give to the Brotherhood provided she will accept it and see to the publishing of it as she does the minutes, etc. I ask no temporal interest in it. My name need not appear in it, and the wording of the preface can be changed to suit.

ISAAC H. BASHORE.

A committee of three (to consist of Brethren J. M. Kimmel, Arthur R. King, and Ervan Eikenberry) was proposed to look into this matter and have the same printed if they see fit. Confirmed by the A. M.

1941 To the Annual Meeting of 1941, Greeting: We as the committee appointed by the A. M. of 1940 to examine an index of the Minutes of our Annual Meetings, compiled by Elder Isaac H. Bashore, and to consider the propriety of having the same printed in a separate booklet, having carefully looked into the matter from several points of view, came to the following agreement: We do not feel to take the responsibility of having the index printed without further counsel from Annual Meeting. Our reasons for so agreeing are:

First. The last published edition of our minute book being well nigh exhausted, some members are looking forward to a new edition in the near future which should include all the minutes to date and a new complete index for the same. Should this be brought about this separate index as proposed would be of no use.

Second, Also it is suggested that in a new Minute Book the minutes be classified by bringing all decisions on the same subject together under one heading with the subjects arranged in alphabetical order. In that case also the separate index would be of no practical use.

In view of the above reasons we did not feel to proceed hastily with the printing of this index, but would propose to defer the matter indefinitely. Respectfully Submitted,

J. M. Kimmel, A. R. King, Ervan Eikenberry, Comm.

The above report was accepted by the meeting and the committee was retained to make arrangements for the printing of a new Minute Book and report to next Annual Meeting.

1942 To The Annual Meeting of 1942, Greeting:—We the committee appointed by the A. M. of 1940 to consider the printing of an index to our Book of Minutes and later minutes of the Annual Meetings (compiled by Elder I. H. Bashore) having found there existed a desire upon the part of a number of members to have a new edition of the minutes printed with all minutes to date and a complete index included, did, therefore, in view of said desire, report to the A. M. of 1941 that in our judgment it would be well to defer the printing of the afore said index indefinitely or till it be decided whether or not the proposed new minute book shall be printed.

The A. M. of 1941 accepted our report and retained us as a committee to make arrangements for the printing of a new minute book and to report to the A. M. of this year.

In our endeavor to carry out said instructions we found that a number of brethren were in favor of having the minutes classified, while others would be satisfied to have the present book reprinted as it is, that is, in the consecutive form. We, therefore, proceeded to obtain price quotations on 1000 copies,

First, in the consecutive form as at present. For this form the stereotype plates (which have been kept) which were used in printing former editions could be used again with minor alterations, whereby there would be a considerable saving in cost. The sale price per single copy in this form, according to quotations at hand would be around $1.75.

Second, in the classified form for which all new type would be required, the price per single copy would have to be probably more than twice that of the consecutive form.

The quotations we obtained were for immediate acceptance. By the time we can be prepared to place an order there may be some variation from prices now at hand. However, we may be able to make further investigation with the object of getting the work done at a somewhat lower cost.

This report is presented for the consideration of this A. M. in deciding which (if either) of the two forms herein described, it will adopt.

Respectfully Submitted,
J. M. Kimmel, Arthur R. King, Ervan Eikenberry,
Committee

The Standing Committee anticipating that this A. M. would accept the above report, thinks it well to retain the present Minute Book Committee and that they shall be paid for their labors by the treasurer of the Tent Committee. Passed by the Meeting. This meeting decides further that a new minute book be printed, and it is left to the judgment of the committee of what kind it shall be, and that they may add to their number as they see fit.

Acknowledgments

1797 ART. 2. It was in union concluded, that if a brother or sister should commit a fault or sin, that were not between brother and brother, but open before the world, then the church is to examine, and if the fault is not so criminal that the church is compelled to cut him off entirely, according to the word of the Lord, and the failing member acknowledges and repents for his sin, such should make a public acknowledgment in presence of believers and unbelievers. But if he should harden his heart, and would not be obedient to the counsel of the church, then the members could not have fellowship with him until such time he becomes willing to acknowledge and to obey, and then the whole church should heartily pardon and forgive him, in the name of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

1797 ART. 6. At the yearly meeting on Blackwater, Va., in 1797, "It was concluded in union that when a brother or sister should commit a fault which was not between brother and brother, but public before the world, the church is to investigate the case, and if the fault was not so criminal as to compel the church to cut him off entirely, according to the word of the Lord, and the failing member sees it and is sorry for his sin, then he should make a public acknowledgment in the presence of the believers and the unbelieving. But if he should harden his heart, and would not obey the counsel of the church, then members could not have communion with such until the time when he becomes willing to acknowledge and to obey.

1821 ART. 7. What is to be done when a member commits a fault which is not between brother and brother, but publicly, against the gospel? Considered, that such a member (provided it is no crime, such as stated in I. Cor. 5) should always make acknowledgment before the church.

1825 ART. 7. At the yearly meeting in Morrison's Cove, 1825, the question was presented, "In case members commit a public fault for which an acknowledgment is required, should it be made publicly, or only before the church? It was considered, in case the transgression was made without the church, and is deemed by the world a fault, and the transgressor should feel in himself urged to it (to make a public confession), in such case it might be good; but if it should be something that is not deemed a transgression by the world, and the conviction were not truly born from within, or from the heart, then it would be no light before the world, and it would be better done before the membership.

1844 ART. 12. How it is considered, if a member makes an open transgression, and refuses to come to the church to acknowledge it, though he declares his willingness to make acknowledgments before some brethren? It was considered that such private confession could not be counted sufficient, since the word says (I. Tim. v 20): "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear."

1850 ART. 15. Whether it is according to the gospel for a church to lay a public acknowledgment on a brother that has made a public offense? Considered, that the acknowledgment is to be made before the church alone, and before all the members present. (See I. Tim. v. 20)"Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear."

1862 ART. 24. How is it considered when a brother commits an offense against the church, and the church takes his case into consideration? He acknowledges the offense, and is sorry for it, and asks forgiveness; has the church a right to advise him not to commune? Answer: If the church forgives him, and receives him into full fellowship, it has no right to forbid him to commune.

1864 ART. 18. In case a brother commits a trespass openly before the world, should not such one make his acknowledgments openly before the world also? Answer: No, he should not.

1865 ART. 12. In case a member commits a trespass, and the church views it as such, but the said member can not see it as such, but says, "wherein I have done wrong I want you to forgive me." Now, shall such an acknowledgment be considered sufficient, or shall the offending member be required to acknowledge to the wrong that he has done? Answer: We consider that the church must judge of the sufficiency of the acknowledgment of an offending member.

1865 ART. 14. Is it the duty of the church, in all cases, however aggravated, to reclaim an offending member upon an acknowledgment, or should he be expelled in extreme cases, even though he should make acknowledgments? Answer: We consider that, in extreme cases, such as mentioned by the apostle in I. Cor. v., the offending members should be expelled and put away from the church until they give evidence of true humility and contrition.

Admitting Strangers (Not Members) To Church Council

1822 ART. 20. At the yearly meeting in Ohio, 1822, the question was presented, whether such as were not members could be present in our church councils, and the answer was: "Considered, as it was at all times considered, that it could not be allowed."

1838 ART. 5. Whether a member has a right to appoint a meeting for a teacher who is not in our connection? Considered, that it ought not to be according to the exhortation of the apostle. II. John v. 10.

1845 [At the special Yearly Meeting in Indiana, 1845, question 6 was, "Whether in a council-meeting of the church the gospel will allow such as are not members to be admitted?" and the answer was: Considered, that inasmuch as our Savior directs us (Matt. xviii.) the course we are to take with an offending brother, to tell it in the last step **unto the church,** it seemed to be obvious by (or in) the gospel, that those who do not belong to the church ought not to be in council.]

1846 (Special) ART. 3. Whether we should give liberty to preachers of other denominations to speak in our stated meetings? Considered, that it would not be allowed, according to the gospel. (See II. John ix. 10.)

1848 ART. 1. Is it right to admit, or invite, those who do not belong to our church, into our council-meetings? Considered, that it is not proper to admit, into our council-meetings, any person who is not a member of the church.

1849 ART. 18. Whether it is advisable to give preachers of other denominations privilege to speak at our regularly appointed meetings? Considered, it is not advisable.

1863 ART. 22. Which is according to the gospel, to transact church business at our common council-meeting? Shall they be public before the world, or in the presence of our members only? Considered, to be according to the gospel that members only should compose the council-meeting. (See Matt. x, which whole chapter is directed to disciples alone; Matt. xvii. 17, where it says of the disciples coming to Jesus apart; and in Mark vi. 31, Jesus says Himself to His disciples, "Come ye yourselves apart," etc., etc., etc.)

Admitting Testimony From Outsiders

1841 ART. 6. Whether members may be brought before the council of the church, and be judged for a crime only on testimony from without—i. e., from persons that are not members of the church? Considered, that when there is some report abroad of a brother walking disorderly, or having committed a crime, it is the duty of the church to send some brethren to the place where the report has originated, to investigate the matter. If nothing be found establishing the charge, and the member denying the same after a close examination, nothing more can be done. If there should, however, some suspicion be created in the members by the general conduct of the accused, the church may advise such a member not to approach the Lord's table until the matter is cleared up to the satisfaction of the church. But to disown entirely a member on testimony only from without, was not considered right and just according to the gospel.

1845 ART. 9. How it is considered, if brethren are accused by the mouth of two or three witnesses, of honest moral character, but not being members, and their testimony against those members agrees, that they were guilty of drunkenness, or any other crime, and the church has cause to believe such testimony, from other circumstances, but the brethren so accused, deny the charge? Considered, as in the year 1841, Art. 6, that such members might be advised not to approach the Lord's table until the matter is cleared up to the satisfaction of the church; but to judge a brother on testimony from without alone, and without his own confession, would not be just, according to the gospel.

Adultery

1797 ART. 5. The case was presented of married people separating from one another, and then the one party marrying again, thus committing adulty. Afterward the other party also marries again, and then the latter comes to the church and desires to be received by baptism as a member in the church, and it was considered that if the church was agreed, and the applicant should heartily repent, confess, and acknowledge the fault (and especially if the first companion would be dead by this time), we might include such person within the (bounds of the) mercy and merits of Jesus, and receive as a member by baptism.

1812 ART. 4. Concerning a woman who was deserted by her husband; and being informed that he was dead, married again; when afterward her first husband made his appearance again, he showed no concern about her, and went away again; and now he is said again to be dead, and she makes application to be received into the church. Considered, that this can not be done according to the word of God, before there is sure evidence that the first husband is dead, and then upon sincere repentance and acknowledgment she might be received.

1812 ART. 7. Another case was presented of a woman who was deserted by her husband, and after being informed that he was dead, she married again; but the information proved to be untrue; her first husband made his appearance again, but without calling or claiming her he went away the second time, and now he is said again to be dead, and she (the woman) now makes application to be received into the church. The brethren decided that it could not be done according to the word of God, until there is evidence that her first husband be dead, and then only she might be received upon true repentance and confession.

1819 ART. 1. Concerning a woman who married a man who had deserted his wife because she had committed carnal intercourse with another man, as he says, proved by the time of her delivery. Considered, if there can be found no evidence as his (the husband's) assertion, it is not sufficient to decide that it was or is no true wedlock, consequently the woman he has now, with himself, will be considered as adulterers as long as the first wife lives, according to the declaration of the Apostle Paul, Rom. vii. 2, 3. This is left over to further investigation. So we find no liberty to receive persons who live in adulty into the church, as long as the first marriage is not dissolved by death, and then only upon sincere sorrow and repentance they may be received into the communion of the faithful. But if those who are in such case would resolve firmly for God's sake to live separate, and would also indeed do so, and lament sincerely their former state—then there might be mercy in store for them, and they might be thereby reconciled to God.

1819 ART. 6 In a similar case of a woman marrying a man who had left his wife, both were considered adulterers while that first wife lives, according to the declaration of the Apostle Paul (Rom. vii. 2, 3); and that the church could not receive them as members until the first marriage was dissolved by death, and then only upon heartfelt sorrow and repentance. But if those who are in such condition would for the sake of God (and their salvation) firmly resolve and actually (endeavor to) separate (and apart from each other), with godly sorrow for their former transgression, they might find grace and be reconciled with God (through Christ).

1822 ART. 17. With regard to persons who live in adultry, it was considered that they could not be received into the church as long as they live in such condition.

1842 ART. 8. Whether a person who was married, and whose partner broke the marriage vow by fornication, may marry again according to the gospel, after obtaining a bill of divorce? Considered, that according to the word of God, Matt. v 31, 32, xix, 3—10, Mark x 2—12, Luke xvi. 18, and I. Cor. vii 10, 11, 39, a person can not marry again while the first companion lives, and that the gospel considers not only the person that would marry again after being divorced, but also the person who would marry the divorced party, as adulterers.

1858 ART. 12. How it is considered, when a man leaves his wife, and then marries an excluded sister, and afterward moves a considerable distance, where their standing is not generally known; there he makes application to be received into the church, asserting that his first wife had committed fornication, without any other testimony but his own; then a letter is written to the church, where the sister was excluded, for counsel, which is answered, advising to admonish her to love the church; until the Lord may bring about a way for her reception, stating, also, that they could frankly forgive her what she had been excluded for; the letter further stating, that there was a report that her husband's first wife was dead, and another, that she was not. Finally, he was baptized, and she received again, as a sister, without testimony, by the voice of one minister and twenty-one private members, in favor, and one minister, with three private members, opposed to their reception? Considered, that such persons should not be received into the church, under such circumstances, and that the brethren, who received them, have erred, and should make acknowledgments before the church, in order to the reconciliation of those brethren, who have been grieved at their proceedings.

1850 ART. 13. Whether brethren, being requested, should visit and pray for persons living in a state of adultery? Considered, that they should be visited, instructed, and admonished, and as they manifest fruits of repentance, or not, pray for them, according to their state.

1852 ART. 17. How are churches to proceed in the following case? A brother being cut off from the church with an excluded party, and afterward becomes guilty of adultery. Considered, to hold him as the church does such party. See I. Cor. v. 13: "But them that are without, God judgeth."

1855 ART. 10. How is a church to proceed with members, who were disowned because the brother married a sister who was married before to a man (not a brother), and was divorced from him on account of him committing adultery, but who has died since? Considered, if the church is satisfied of the former husband's death, and with the repentance of the brother and sister, they may be received again.

1856 ART. 18. How are we to hold a brother and sister who lived together for some years in lawful matrimony, but not very agreeably, and now they are separated—the brother living with his children in Iowa, and the sister with her friends in Ohio? The church or churches where such members live should investigate the matter, and judge according to the gospel and the circumstances or facts in the case, in the fear of the Lord.

1856 ART. 24. If a man shall put away his wife for the cause of fornication—procuring a bill of divorcement, and marrying another—has he committed the sin of adultry, or could he be received into the church, all the parties still living, if he in all other respects brings forth fruits meet for repentance? After a lengthy discussion, this matter was referred to the next Yearly Meeting.

1859 ART. 8. The twenty-fourth query on the minutes of 1856 being brought forward, it was concluded best for such churches as have occasion to act on such cases, to act in the fear of the Lord, according to their knowledge of the cases.

1858 ART. 7. What is to be done when a man puts away his wife for the cause of adultry and obtains a bill of divorcement, and marries again; the church not knowing of this, nor he that the church disallows of such for some two years after he has become a member. Answer: We have not light enough at present to give any advice different from what the brethren have formerly given.

1858 ART. 46. Should the church receive a person that had been living in a state of matrimony awhile, and apparently did not live in peace; then, leaving his companion, gets married to another one, and, after some time, leaving the second one for the same reason he left the first, and while his first companion was yet living? Considered, that, according to the gospel, such a person should not be received into the church.

1858 ART. 47. How is it considered, in the case of a brother who has been expelled from the church, and then takes up with a woman that has a husband living, and lives with her fifteen years; then her husband dies, and the two get lawfully married, and now he has made application to be taken into the church, and we desire the Yearly Meeting to give counsel what to do? Considered, that he may be received, provided he brings forth fruit meet for repentance.

1858 ART. 54. In case a woman has a husband and has lived with him in matrimony for a year or longer, and then the husband departs and leaves his wife, nothing being heard of him for four or five years, and said wife then marries a second husband, nothing being still heard of her former husband. Years pass on, say twenty-five or six, she living with the second husband all this time, and having children with him, and nothing is still heard of her first husband. Now, the said husband and wife make application to be received into the church. How shall we proceed in such a case? Answer: We think they might be received if the church feels satisfied the first husband is not living.

1859 ART. 17. A man's wife leaves him for no just cause, and she then obtains a bill of divorcement; after this she marries another man; and then, in consequence of this, the husband left, was divorced, and also marries another woman, after some time, with whom he is now living; and he having become convinced of the truth, has made application for baptism. Can he be received into the church? Answer. We think he can not, while living with the last woman as a husband. (See I. Cor. vii. 10, 11.)

1859 ART. 21. A man marries his uncle's wife, but afterward thinks he discovers it forbidden in Levit. xviii. 14, and xx. 20, and separates from her. He then marries another woman. He now desires to be received into the church. Can he be received, as the first woman is still living, and in a married connection with another man? Answer: according to the civil law, the first marriage would be considered lawful, and, consequently, the second marriage is contrary to the gospel, and he can not, therefore, be received into the church by baptism, while he ,and the woman with whom he is living, are living together in the relation of man and wife.

1862 ART. 3. If a sister is married to a man, who, after living with her awhile, leaves her, and she, not hearing from him for several years, marries again, can she be held as a member? Answer: No; she could not be held as a member.

1862 ART. 28. Can the church hold in fellowship persons living as husband and wife, while the husband's former wife is living, from whom he was divorced, but not for the cause of fornication? Answer: We consider, according to Matt. xix. 9, that the church can not hold such in fellowship.

1863 ART. 7. A woman leaves her husband because he committed adultery, and he then leaves the neighborhood. About three years after the woman marries again, having obtained a divorce from her former husband, and after the expiration of another three years, both the woman and the husband she now has, apply to the church to become members, the woman not having heard from her discarded husband all that time; can she be received? We think they can not be received without the church being satisfied that the first husband be dead. I. Cor. vii. 39.

1864 ART. 2. If a sister has a husband that is not a member in the church, and it is known that he is an adulterer, is it consistent with the gospel for her to live with him and be his wife? And if it is not consistent for her to do so, has she a right to get a bill of divorcement according to law? Answer: as to the first part of the query, we think it should be left to her choice whether to live with him or not. And to the second, we say, with Paul (I. Cor. vii. 10, 11), "But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried."

1866 ART. 14. How is it considered if a minister violates his marriage contract, by committing adultery secretly, and continues the transgression for over one year, and in the meantime seeks and obtains the ordained elder's peace, discharges all the holy functions of that office, preaching, baptizing, anointing the sick, solemnizing marriages, and breaking bread; can he ever be received again? And, if so, how long after having been expelled? Answer: We think he can, as a private member, but not until the church in which he lives is fully satisfied that his conduct throughout proves that he has indeed repented. II Cor. ii 6—8.

1866 ART. 44. This question refers to the case of the church receiving a class of persons separated from their former partners in the marriage contract, and who have married again. It was concluded to postpone this question to the next Annual Meeting.

1867 ART. 16. Does the fornication committed, as in Matt. xix, 9, place the parties in such a position that they can never be reconciled to each other and live together again? Answer: The guilty party giving evidence of true repentance, they may be reconciled. (See I. Cor. vii. 11; II. Cor. ii. 6, 7.)

1867 ART. 17. We desire this Annual Meeting to consider Art. 18, of the minutes of 1856, and give us the scriptural rule to govern such cases. Answer: If the cause of separation be malice and ill-will, they can not be retained in the church, according to Heb. xii. 14, 15.

1867 ART. 18. Do the Scriptures teach that it is committing adultery to marry a person who is divorced, while the first partner is living? Answer: They do. (See Luke xvi. 18.)

1867 ART. 36. A man, having a wife, and she leaves him and takes up with several other men, one of whom is compelled by law to marry her; and some time after this the first mentioned man marries a single woman, and this woman made application to be received into the church, and the circumstances, as given above, not being known by the church, she was baptized; and then her husband also made application to be received. We desire the judgment of the Annual Meeting, whether this woman can be retained in the church, and whether her husband can be received?

1868 ART. 1. Do the words of the Savior, "Except for fornication," as they stand connected with his other language, in the ninth verse of the nineteenth chapter of Matthew, annul the marriage covenant or contract, or do they only suspend it until fruits worthy of repentance are manifested on the part of the transgressor—to the satisfaction of the church? Considered, by this meeting that the words in question do annul the marriage contract. Answer: We postpone this question indefinitely, but advise the churches to proceed cautiously when they have cases of this character to act upon.

1870 ART. 14. Whereas much dissatisfaction exists among the brethren, relative to the answer of the first article of the minutes of 1868, and the insertion of the answer of a district-meeting before the answer of the Annual Meeting, whereby many are unable to understand what the answer of the Annual Meting to said query was, will the district-meeting agree to ask the Annual Meeting to define plainly to the whole brotherhood, through the minutes of this year, how much of said article is the answer of the Annual Meeting, and authoritative? Answer, yes; for we very much desire a better understanding on that subject, and we therefore ask a reconsideration of Art. 1, of the minutes of 1868. Answer: We agree to reconsider said article, and leave out of the minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1868 the answer of the district of eastern Maryland, which reads as follows: "Considered, by this meeting, that the words in question do annul the marriage contract." And as a large proportion of the brotherhood understand that it only suspends, while others understand that it annuls the marriage contract, and viewing this difference of sentiment among us, and the majority believing that fornication only suspends the marriage contract, and as the tendency of the practice of the age is toward too great a looseness of the binding power of the marriage vow, we think it most advisable, for the present, to act in the church as if the marriage contract is only broken by death.

1870 ART. 16. A man goes to the army, and when he comes home his wife was married to another man, and she continues to be the second man's wife. Some time after he marries a widow, and they live together agreeably for some years. They both then make application to be received into the church by baptism, manifesting fruits of repentance to the satisfaction of the church, his first wife, in the meanwhile, still living in adultery. The church examines him concerning separation, and finds him innocent. Then examines the Scriptures, and the advice of the Annual Meeting of 1857, Art. 8; also, minutes of 1856, Art. 24, in the fear of the Lord, and in the presence of the applicants, and according to the best judgment the church receives them. Can they be held as members of the church? Answer: They can not while they live together.

1870 ART. 17. How is it considered, according to the gospel, if a man marries a wife, and afterward they part; then he marries a second wife, but puts her away because she is not an honest woman. Then he applies for a bill of divorce, and gets it. But he obtained no divorce from the first woman. Then, to satisfy the law, he marries his first wife, and he and his wife both make application to become members of the church; can they be received into the church? Answer: They can be received by giving satisfactory evidence of true repentance.

1873 ART. 22. A man who was living in adultry, after making a full statement of his standing to the brethren, was received into the church and afterward received a letter of full membership from said church and moved into another district of the church, and this church rejected him by the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1850, Art. 12; would it be according to gospel, and decisions of the Annual Meeting, for the brethren that received him into the church to make acknowledgment to the man also, or only to the church? Answer: We consider that the brethren who received him should make acknowledgment to the church, and also to the man, if he shall ask it, and give him a reason for receiving him.

1877 ART. 18. We petition the Annual Meeting, through the district meeting, to reconsider the divorce question. For instance: A woman takes up with a young man, and leaves her husband and three children; then she was disowned. After some years she gets a divorce, and the husband married another woman. Can he now be retained as a member of the church? Both were members of the church before the wife left her husband. Is he now living in adultery, or are the innocent free or clear, according to the Savior's words, "Except it be for fornication?" (Matt. xix. 9.) Answer: We defer this question.

1879 ART. 19. A woman marries, and her husband leaves her and lives with his brother's wife; his wife sues at law, proves him guilty of fornication, obtains a bill of divorce, afterwards marries another man, and then makes application for membership. Under the circumstances can she, according to the gospel, be received? Deferred by Annual Meeting.

1880 ART. 2. What should be done by a church upon learning that a member has a former companion living, from whom a divorce has been obtained because of fornication? Article 8, of minutes of 1857, does not remove the difficulty. There was another question, involving the same principle, from the Middle District of Pennsylvania. These questions were given to a committee of seven brethren, for them to frame an answer to be submitted to the General Council. The committee submitted the following answer, which was adopted by the annual conference: "We, your committee, after due deliberation, in the fear of the Lord, come to the following conclusion: We adopt the decision of Annual Meeting of 1868, Article 1, which reads as follows: 'We postpone this question indefinitely, but advise the churches to proceed cautiously when they have cases of this character to act upon.' Samuel Harley, J. W. Brumbaugh, D. B. Sturgis, George Holler, D. E. Brubaker, Jacob Rife, G. D. Zollars, committee.

1880 ART. 22. A sister departs from her unbelieving husband and procures a bill of divorce on the ground of cruel treatment; can she retain her membership in the church, while holding in her possession the bill of divorce, providing she remains unmarried? Answer: Yes, she can.

1883 SEC. 11. ADULTERY, FORNICATION. All decisions on these subjects are in harmony with the gospel as understood by the old brethren. Hence all retained so far as they embrace the same facts in similar cases. (Accepted).

1933 ART. 7. (1st query) Since it has become apparent that there are different views taken from Christ's teaching in Matt. 19:9 and also Paul's in 1 Cor. 6:11, thereby disturbing the peace and union of our Brotherhood in dealing with those that commit fornication and adultery, it is necessary that we distinguish the difference between the two evils as well as to know the meaning of the above scriptures. Hence, fornication is a sin committed by persons not united in marriage who have broken a marriage vow or single persons, while adultery is a sin committed by persons united in marriage when one or both have former compannions living.

Now, Christ's teaching in Matt. 19:9 is that man has no authority from high heaven to suspend the sacred marriage vow for any cause except it be for fornication, and never annul Matt. 19:6, Mark 10:9, John 4:18 or I Cor. 7:11, and then only until they repent of their evil deeds, or it would be impossible for them to come in favor and fellowship with God before whom they have made the marriage vow.

The teaching of Paul in Cor. 6:11 is that those Corinthians repented of their evil deeds and no longer retained those evil characteristics or they would not have been sanctifid or justifid. Acts 8:23, John 13:11 and II Peter 2:22.

1933 Therefore, we ask this Annual Meeting to reaffirm the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1898, Art. 4, as it is in harmony with Christ's and the apostles' teaching and the faith and practice of our fraternity.

(2nd query) Will not this Yearly Meeting consider the acceptance of precious souls into the church where the man has put away his first wife for the cause of fornication and marries another; which is in accordance with the Savior's teachings in Matthew 19:9 and 5:32? See Minutes of 1856, Art. 24; 1857, Art. 8! 1867, Art. 32; 1868, Art. 1; and Reconsidered minutes, Sec. 11.

(3rd query) Inasmuch as minutes of 1898, Art. 4, has caused some confusion and contention, as it does not reach every condition, due to its lack of breadth and completeness, only calling for the reconsideration of minutes of 1797, Art. 5.

Therefore, does the said article annul the words of Jesus as given in Matthew 5:32, "Save for the cause of fornication," and Matthew 19:9, "Except it be for fornication?"

Answer: Yes, this Annual Meeting agrees to consider the meaning and purpose of Matthew 19:9 and I Corinthians 6:11, and in union agrees to endorse the interpretations as sustained by the teaching of Christ and the apostles, referred to in the query. And it also agrees to reaffirm the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1898, Art. 4, by adding the following words: Until he or she would put away or cease to live with the second companion, as long as the first companion liveth. On these conditions all such can be received into fellowship with the church. See I Cor. 7:39; Rom. 7:2, 3; Matt. 5:32. Passed.

1938 ART. 8. Inasmuch as there seems to be a difference of understanding in the Brotherhood as to disposing of cases that come within the teaching of Paul's first letter to the church at Cornith, fifth chapter, wherein he points out in verse one, an existing evil act among them, and taught them throughout this chapter how to proceed in such a case; Now, in view of Paul's teaching and the general tenor and spirit of God's word, can a local church which may have cases somewhat similar to deal with, wherein the same act was committed by members who afterward marry, after having considered all evidence and testimony and attitudes in the case, forgive and retain such members in fellowship upon their open confession and expression of sorrow, or shall they be disfellowshipped?

Also, do the 36th, 37th and 38th verses of 1 Cor. 7, have any reference to fornication?

Now, we do earnestly beg this Annual Meeting of 1938, to give a definite answer to the above that a more uniform understanding may be had among us on this very important subject.

Answer: According to the Scripture upon the subject and the Minutes of A. M. 1855, Art. 18 and 1863, Art. 12, any member found guilty of fornication must be excommunicated. The verses 36, 37, 38, of I Cor. 7, have no reference to the above, but purely to a condition of father and daughter. Passed.

1938 ART. 4. We desire this Annual Conference to give us the proper interpretation of I Cor. 7th chapter, 10th and 11th verses. These verses have caused considerable contention. Some hold that man and wife (because of family trouble) can live in separate homes and, at the same time, be in full fellowship with the church. In these two verses it is the Lord speaking. Then, does the Lord instruct Paul to write this epistle to the believers in Christ, that when husband and wife cannot live peaceably together they may separate?

Christ suffers the husband or the wife to separate from his or her companion for fornication only (Matt. 19:9) and not for every cause, and concludes by saying "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

For convenience we will quote the two verses referred to. (1 Cor. 7:10,—): "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: But if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife. "Does reconciled mean to remain separated? or does it mean to agree and come together again? We sincerely desire a consistent Scriptural answer.

Answer: To first part: Some hold that man and wife (because of family trouble) can live in separate homes and at the same time be in full fellowship with the church. No, it is not scriptural. See Eph. 5:19-33.

To second part: Does reconciled mean to remain separated? No, it does not.

To third part: Or does it mean to agree and come together again? Yes. Answer: Passed.

Advancing Brethren In The Ministry

1848 ART. 7. How to make arrangement, that in every church brethren be authorized to baptize, and serve at communion tables? Considered, to leave this to the judgment of the churches, with the advice of neighboring ordained elders, whether they think it necessary or expedient.

1850 ART. 19. Whether it would be agreeable to the order of the church, where there is a bishop and two or more teaching brethren in one arm of the church, to elect a bishop without the consent of the church? Considered, necessary, by all means, to have the voice of the church in such cases.

1856 ART. 20. Is it the rule and order among the brethren to forward a brother to baptize at the same time he is put in the ministry? Answer, No.

1858 ART. 19 What is the ancient and established order of the brethren in advancing speakers to the second degree of office? Are they received with hand and kiss? Considered, that the proper way is to receive them with hand and kiss.

1864 ART. 33. Will this Annual Meeting adopt some form or order for forwarding ministers from one degree to another, as it has been differently performed heretofore? Answer: The order of the brethren, as already given by the Annual Meeting, is to forward brethren by the hand and kiss.

1871 ART. 1. What is to be done when a church needs a brother in the second degree of the ministry, but lacks confidence to advance the one that is oldest in office; yet, out of necessity, the church has tried twice to advance him, but was opposed each time by the majority of the members voting against him? Answer: The brother should be informed of the cause of such opposition, so that he may have an opportunity to remove it; and if he can remove the cause, then the church may, and should, advance him; but if the cause is not removed, then the church may advance the next one in office.

1873 ART. 13. This district-meeting requests the Annual Meeting to reconsider Art. 19, of the minutes of 1858, concerning the manner of advancing brethren in the ministry, from the first to the second degree. Answer: We consider the order given in Art. 19, of the minutes of 1858, the proper order.

Soliciting For Institutions

1878 ART. 12. Inasmuch as it is thought that brethren who solicit aid for some of the institutions gotten up among us, do sometimes take advantage of some of the members, should not such solicitors first apply to the elder of the church in which he wishes to salicit, that he may consult with his church in regard to the matter, that no advantage may be taken of any? Answer: Deferred.

Advertising Against Hunting

1891 ART. 1. Inasmuch as we are now living in a time in which are nonconforming and nonresistant principles are being tried in various ways, we pray the brethren assembled in Yearly Council to take into serious consideration the impropriety of our members advertising against hunting by erecting boards on their premises, or otherwise using terms having the appearance of evil and infringing upon our non-resistant and nonconforming principles which we desire to hold sacred under all circumstances. Therefore, that peace and unanimity continue to exist, and that the members of the church fully comply with 1 Cor. i. 10, and Rom. xii. 1, 2,, etc., we ask Annual Council to advise and decide against such measure and steps taken by us professing Christ and his doctrine. Answer: This Annual Meeting advises brethren not to do so, according to the above scriptures.

Advisement to Local Churches

1905 ART. 6. Several requests came to the elders of this Yearly Meeting from the Quinter Church, Gove County, Kansas, asking for advisement in the case of Wm. Barton, and also in the case of Zachariah Troyer in relation to the Limestone Church, Kansas. Some advice was given to be sent to the parties concerned. Granted.

Agents

1901 ART. 1. Do the brethren, in Annual Meeting assembled, consider it right for members to act as agents, and make a practice of going around over the country to persuade people to buy? Answer: Considered not right for brethren to do so.

1928 ART. 1. Is it right according to the Gospel and order of the brethren for a brother or sister to be a licensed real estate broker? 2. Cor. 6:14. Answer: We think it best for our members not to become real estate brokers. Passed.

1937 ART. 6. Some of our dear members are deeply grieved because of some of the brethren, and even the ministry, having gone in the real estate business. Therefore, will not this Annual Meeting say we can not break the bread of communion with brethren who engage in that occupation? See I Cor. 10:32, 2 Cor. 6:3 and 14.

Answer: We think it inconsistent with the Gospel and the order of our Brethren for our members and ministers to engage in the real estate business, either licensed or unlicensed, and strongly advise our members against engaging in such business. Passed by the meeting.

Alms, Collecting

1788 ART. 1. Resolved, unanimously, that hereafter no member of the church, whether brother or sister, under no pretext whatever, should go from church to church, or from house to house, to collect alms; but where there is any want or distress of a member (greater than the church to which he or she belongs is able to relieve), the church shall state the case in writing, and send it to the next church, if necessary by the member himself, and if in that church full relief could not be obtained, the writing should be renewed until relief is accomplished, if even it were necessary to call upon all the churches. And we deem it proper that every church should state on the writing how much is yet lacking.

1793 ART. 1. Inasmuch as God has commanded his ancient people Israel, by Moses, and said, "There shall be no beggar among you (German translation), for the Lord shall greatly bless thee in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance to possess it," etc. Deut. xv. 4. And says further, "If there be amongst you a poor man of thy brethren within any of thy gates in thy land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not harden thy heart, nor shut thy hand from thy poor brother; but thou shalt open thy hand wide unto him, and shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need in that which he wanteth." And says again, "Beware that there be not a thought in thy wicked heart, saying," etc. "Thou shalt freely give him, and thy heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him; because that for this thing the Lord thy God shall bless thee in all thy works, and in all thou puttest thy hands unto." And again says, "For the poor shall never cease out of the land; therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thy hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy in thy land," etc. Deut. xv. 7-11. And the apostle James says, "Hearken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom," etc. James ii. 5. And inasmuch it has happened by bad people, that such as were actually poor have been robbed of their gifts by men going about and pretending to be brethren, have asked assistance, which they have afterward spent in taverns by drinking and gambling; now, in order to prevent such deception, some years ago, at a large meeting in Conestoga, it was resolved unanimously that no member should go from church to church, or from house to house, to collect alms, etc. And inasmuch as members have been imposed upon since in a deceitful manner, therefore we have concluded again in this present great meeting unanimously, that hereafter no member shall be allowed to go himself to another church; but if there should be found a member in want or distress, the overseer in the church where such member lives is to hold counsel with the church, in order to see whether they would relieve the want, and if so, it should not go any further; but if not, then the overseer, with the counsel of the church, should send a letter to the adjoining church with a brother of his church, and if there the want can be relieved, it shall go no further; but if the want be not redressed then according to the finding of that church, it should be proceeded in the same manner from that to the next church, until relief is obtained; so that our loving brethren and members, who, according to the doctrine of Paul, are willing to do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith (Gal. vi. 10), may no longer be imposed upon in such deceitful manner. This is not to be understood that we should not do good, also, to those poor without the church, etc.

1812 ART. 3. Cncerning a woman whose husband is dead; and having several children and no property, and her hands too weak to provide for them; it was considered that the church should provide for her, and at the proper time to put out the children in good places, and to good people, and thus supply their wants.

1840 ART. 2. How it is considered when poor members are left to the overseers of the poor in the township for maintenance?Considered, that the church to which such a member belongs ought to investigate the case, and to take care of her own poor according to the gospel.

1851 ART. 20. Whether it is according to the gospel, to let any of our poor members go to the county poor-house? Considered, that we know of no passage in the gospel authorizing this, but of many, where the duty of the church is expressly enjoined, to support their poor members, and, if not able, to ask aid from neighboring churches.

1852 ART. 18. Whether members have a right, by the gospel, to go begging for money through the different churches? Considered, that they have no right, according to the gospel, and where there are poor members that are in a suffering condition, it is the duty of the church in which they live to see to it, and to supply their wants, and if that church is not able to support them, the church has a right to apply to the neighboring churches for help, and not the brother that is in want.

1854 ART. 20. Is it not the duty of each church to keep their poor, and not let them become a county-charge, or, is it right to send a brother to the poor-house at the expense of the county? Considered, that this question was fully and correctly answered in 1851 and 1852. (See Minutes of 1851, Art. 20, and of 1852, Art. 18.)

1855 ART. 15. How is it considered, if a member is taken to the Lunatic Asylum by the children, that are not members; is it the duty of the church to pay the expenses? Considered, that the church is not bound to pay any debts but those which it contracts.

1857 ART. 12. How is it considered, if a poor brother becomes insane, and void of all reason, so much so as to become dangerous, and very troublesome, and a place can scarcely be obtained for him in a private family upon any condition, a poor-house being in the county, are the brethren bound to keep him, according to the gospel, or are they permitted to deliver him to the trustees of the poor, to take charge of him? Answer: A member of the church should not be put into the poor-house, if it can possibly be avoided.

1862 ART. 29. Is it right for a son to put his father on the county to be kept, both being members of the church? And if not right, where does the father belong? in the district where he is on the county, or in that from which he was taken? Answer: We consider it wrong for a son or brother to do so. And the father, under the circumstances stated, would, of course, belong to the district from which he was taken.

1866 ART. 48. In response to a petition from the brethren in Virginia, for pecuniary help for Bro. Peter Crumpacker, an elder in the church, who lost three thousand dollars in getting his brethren out of prison, and by being robbed by the rebels, this Annual Meeting recommends to all the churches in the north to assist liberally this worthy brother to bear his loss which he, through love to his brethren, sustains. And we appoint Bro. Benjamin Moomaw the receiver, to receive the funds collected. His express office is Bonsacks, Roanoke County, Virginia, and his post-office is the same.

1867 ART. 3. What is the order of the brethren when members have become entirely dependent upon the church? Have they the privilege of moving from one branch of the church to another without the consent of the church into which they propose to move? Answer: The church into which such members propose to move should first be counseled before they move, and if this is not complied with, the charges should be paid by the church from which they moved.

1870 ART. 11. Is it the duty of the church to support a widow after she is sixty years of age, having nephews who are able to support her? (See I. Tim. v. 16.) Answer: It is, provided the nephews have not the will or means to support her.

1871 ART. 10. Is it the duty of the church to support a widowed sister over threescore years old, and who has nephews that are members of the church, and these nephews being able to support her? Answer: We agree to defer this subject to our next Annual Meeting.

1875 ART. 6. When members, who are dependent on the church, move from one state to another, expecting to be maintained by their children, and fail, which church's duty is it to maintain them? Answer: This meeting thinks it is the duty of the church from which they moved to maintain them.

1875 ART. 12. Whereas, it is not considered to be according to the Scriptures to keep our poor in the county poor-house, is not the church under obligations to build a house to keep our poor in, providing the brethren petition the legislature to be exempt from paying our poor tax into the county treasury? Answer: We refer this back as a matter of purely local interest.
1884 SEC. 41. ASKING AID. We adopt the decision of 1852, Article 18.

Alms For Freedmen of South

1866 ART. 21. Inasmuch as the freedmen of the south are in a starving condition, and also destitute of education and Christianity, would not this district council-meeting (southern district of Indiana) think it advisable to adopt some plan for their relief, and present it to our next Annual Conference for their deliberation? Whereupon it was resolved that this meeting make arrangements to raise funds, and appoint two brethren to go into the Southern States as soon as the nature of the case will admit of it, and distribute those funds among the needy, irrespective of color, and also preach the gospel whenever opportunity may present itself. (Some further particulars relative to the manner of raising the funds were given, but are here omitted for want of room). It was further concluded to submit the above to the Annual Meeting, and if not approved of, it was not to be carried out. The following is the action of the Annual Meeting upon the above. We heartily approve of the above, and bid our brethren God speed, and recommend to our brotherhood to imitate the worthy example of our dear brethren in southern Indiana.

Anointing the Sick

1797 ART. 4. From James v. 14, etc., the brethren testified unanimously, "That the sick who desire and call for it should be anointed, according to the word of the holy apostle, in the name of the Lord."

1812 ART. 1. In case a brother or sister should desire in their sickness to be anointed, it might be administered to them, provided they would not seek further help from an earthly physician; and if it should so be that the Lord would raise them again to health, and they should fall sick again, and think the Lord would call them away, and they asked again to be anointed, we would have no right from the word of God to refuse them, and it should be left to those brethren's wisdom who are called to do as the anointing will teach them. I. John ii. 20.)

1827 ART. 1. About the ordinance of anointing the sick, the manner of proceeding has ever been, first to sing a few verses, and with a united prayer to turn to God. Then (there should always be two brethren) the one reaches forth his hand and the other poureth the oil on it, and the first puts the same on the head of the sick, and says the words, which the Apostle James teaches (chap. v. 14), "Thou are anointed in the name of the Lord." and thus three times but the words only once said. Then both brethren lay their hands upon the head of the sick, and pray over him. For it is not considered to be intended only for an inward unction, but an outward anointing, whereof the apostle speaks, as mentioned before.

1828 ART. 5. Whether a member might be anointed more than once, was considered and decided, that it may be done on request of the sick person.

1837 ART. 4. How it is considered, to administer the anointing of the sick, or to hold an election, without an ordained brother (elder) being present? It is the advice, that the anointing of the sick should not be administered without an ordained brother, except in a case of necessity, that no such is to be had; for the word says: "Call for the elders of the church. As to holding elections, it is considered that no election ought to be held without the presence of (two or) at least one ordained brother.

1844 ART. 9. What to do in case a member, on a sick or death-bed, requests to have the bread of communion broken unto? Considered, that the word of God does not seem to us to justify the breaking of the bread of communion to an individual member (for where there is but one, there can be no communion, and that therefore we would be more safe to direct such a member to the grace and mercy of God in Christ Jesus, and to the advice of the apostle (James v. 14), where he says: "Is any sick among you, let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord," etc. If they still insist upon partaking of the bread and wine, in remembrance of their dying Savior, they might be gratified, as it has been done heretofore, if there should be a love-feast in the neighborhood, by sending to them of the blessed bread and wine, or by holding a small love-feast at the right time and in the proper order at their houses.

1850 ART. 30. Who are the proper persons in the church to administer the ordinance recorded by James (v. 14)? Considered, the bishops, or ordained elders.

1850 ART. 31. Is there any second order in the church, who may administer the above ordinance in cases of great and pressing necessity, when the proper administrators can not be had in time for the urgency of the case? Considered, in such case, brethren in less office, if at least one of them is authorized to baptize, might serve.

1850 ART. 32. May the above ordinance be administered to a person who is not a member of the church, although solemnly believing in the healing virtues of the above, both spiritual and bodily, and requesting the church; such person being in a dangerous situation, having shown fruits of repentance, and perfect willingness, if spared, to bow under the order of the church? Considered, that it could not be done, but that we are to direct them to the grace and mercy of God.

1852 ART. 19. How is it considered, if a brother is legally expelled from the church, and afterward is taken sick, when he calls for the brethren, and requests of them to be anointed, and the brethren do anoint him, knowing that he is excluded from the church? Considered, that according to gospel, we have no right to anoint such as are not in fellowship with the church. The Word (See James v.) goes only to the faithful.

1852 ART. 20. Are persons, who can be up and about, and go to meeting, proper subjects to receive the anointing, or has the gospel only reference to such who are altogether confined? Considred, that the apostle has only alluded to those who are sick or in a decline of life.

1852 ART. 21. Is it agreeable to the sense of the word, that the anointing should be performed more than once in the same illness or confinement? Considered, that no person should be anointed more than once in the same sickness, according to our understanding of the word of God.

1853 ART. 43. Concerning anointing the sick with oil. Considered, that it should be administered according to the manner laid down by the brethren in the minutes of 1844, to be reprinted now again, if there is room left.

1858 ART. 25. In the phrase, "Anoint thy head" (Matt. vi. 17), is the anointing literal? and, if so, with what is the head to be anointed? Answer: We think the anointing is literal, and that it is to be done with oil; but we think, when it is observed, it should be done in a way so that it will not attract public notice.

1860 ART. 5. How is it considered when members of the church, that are sick, call for the elders of the church, and are anointed according to the gospel, and then again resort to the use of medicine; is it wrong to do so? Answer: We do not consider it wrong according to the gospel to do so.

1860 ART. 6. As we see a difference in the words used in anointing the sick, we therefore ask for the most proper ceremony and manner for observing the same, according to the gospel and practice of the old brethren. Answer: As the difference is not stated in the query, we know of nothing better than that which the brethren have given us in the appendix to the minutes of 1853. The following is the order referred to:

About the anointing of the sick. (See Art. 43.) From the minutes of the Yearly Meeting, in Augusta County, Virginia, in the year 1827.)

Of the order of anointing the sick. The order has ever been, in the first place to sing a few lines, and to turn to God in a united prayer. Then (there ought always to be two brethren) the one holds out his hand, and the other pours the oil on it, and the first putteth the same on the head of the sick, and says the words which the Apostle James teacheth (chap. v. 14): "Thou art anointed in the name of the Lord," and thus three times, but the words only once said. Then both brethren lay their hands upon the head of the sick, and pray over him, for it is not considered to be intended only an inward unction, but an outward anointing, whereof the apostle speaks, as mentioned before.

1860 (From manuscript accounts of elder brethren concerning the same, and exhibiting it more particularly.) As regards the anointing, it requires two brethren in order to perform it according to the advice of the apostle, since he says: "Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him." These words require more than one. Now, when we are going to perform the same, the first we do, after singing a few appropriate lines and briefly exhorting, is to turn to God, unitedly, and to pray God for a blessing upon ourselves, upon the sick member, and upon all, as we do in a meeting, and there is liberty to pray for all the brethren present. If time will permit, and strangers are present, the passage from James v. may be read, as far as relates to this matter, and briefly commented upon. Then the sick member is raised to a sitting posture, and the elder brother reacheth forth his hand, and the other brother pours the oil upon it, which he, the first, puts upon the head of the sick, and thus three times saying the words of the apostle: "Thou are anointed in the name of the Lord, unto the strengthening of thy faith, unto the comforting of thy conscience and unto a full assurance of the remission of thy sins," or as the Lord may give utterance; and then the brethren both put their hands on the sick, even as it is done when a brother is ordained, and pray chiefly for the sick member. Such an example we have of the Savior, as we see in Mark vi. 15, and xvi. 18, and this is the order the brethren have administered the same. Brethren, also, who are not ordained, may administer it in cases of necessity.

1862 ART. 54. Who are the elders spoken of by James, that are to be sent to anoint the sick in the name of the Lord? Answer: The ordained elders, if they can be obtained; if not, the next in office.

1865 ART. 3. The apostle James says, "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church," etc. Now, inasmuch as the apostle says **elders,** and not **ministers,** in the first and second degree, would it not be more consistent with the gospel to send for ordained elders in all cases? Answer: "We consider the decisions of the Annual Meeting of 1850 and 1862 upon this subject satisfactory and correct. (The following is taken from the minutes of those years: Who are the proper persons in the church to administer the ordinance recorded in James v. 14? Considered, the bishops or ordained elders. Article 30, 1850: Is there any second order of persons in the church who may administer the above ordinance in cases of great and pressing necessity, when the proper administrators can not be had in time for the urgency of the case? Considered, in such case brethren in less office, if at least one of them is authorized to baptize, might serve. Article 31, 1850: Who are the elders spoken of by James, that are to be sent to anoint the sick in the name of the Lord? Answer: The ordained elders, if they can be obtained, if not, the next in office. Article 54, 1862.)

1865 ART. 4. How is it considered when elders in different churches teach that it is not necessary to send for elders to anoint the sick, but that brethren in the first and second degree can do it as well as elders? Answer: We do not consider it consistent with the gospel for elders so to teach.

1867 ART. 21. Who are the proper persons to perform the duty of anointing the sick? James v. 14, 15. Answer: We think the minutes of former Annual Meetings give a satisfactory answer to this query.

1869 ART. 9. Should brethren be allowed to anoint the sick without first knowing of them whether they are at peace with all, as much as lieth in them; and if not, should it not be required of the sick, before anointing them, to confess their faults one to another, that they may be healed, and whether they should not be fully resigned to the will of God whether to live or die? Answer: We consider the direction for anointing the sick, already given by our brethren, sufficient for ordinary occasions, but when any thing further is necessary, brethren called upon to anoint should act accordingly.

1869 ART. 17. As there seems to be a discord in the decision of the annual meeting of 1850, Art. 32, and the Annual Meeting of 1827, Art. 4, we wish to have them harmonized, if possible. Answer: We consider that no unbaptized person can be a member of the church, and therefore can not be anointed.

1878 ART. 16. Are we justifiable in ordaining a brother who refuses to anoint any one who expects to die and even has no desire to get well, but will anoint for the restoration of health, he possessing the qualifications specified by the apostles? Deferred.

1897 ART. 3. Is it according to the gospel or the ancient order of the church for the officiating brethren to take off their coats while anointing the sick? Answer: There being no established order nor direct scripture touching the question contained in the query, that we know of, we recommend that the officiating brethren keep their coats on while engaged in the work.

1898 ART. 2. As there is still a difference in the practice of anointing the sick, we ask the Annual Meeting of 1898 whether the form given in minutes of 1860, Art. 6, is sufficient, as some districts think it is, while other districts, after the sick one is anointed, have the members present to receive them with hand and kiss the same as we receive one when baptized. We desire a oneness. Answer: We think the minute referred to is sufficient, and that it is not expedient to receive them with hand and kiss.

Anointing the Head

1858 ART. 25. In the phrase, "Anoint thy head" (Matt. vi. 17), is the anointing literal? and, if so, with what is the head to be eanointed? Answer: We think the anointing is literal, and that it is to be done with oil; but we think, when it is observed, it should be done in a way so that it will not attract public notice.

Anointing of Christ

1870 ART. 26. In relation to the anointing of Christ, as recorded in Matt. xxvi. 13, and presented by one of the district-meetings, we would say that the subject is worthy of our consideration and attention, but we do not think it best or necessary to give any direction as to time or place at which it should be preached; and because of its length we omit the query, as it came from the district-meeting.

Assignment of Property

1822 ART. 10. How is it viewed when a brother assigns his property to another, with a view to defraud his neighbors (creditors)? It is considered, that we can not hold them in fellowship.

1858 ART. 38. How is it considered if a brother makes an assignment, and how shall he be dealt with? Answer: That it is not right for a brother to make an assignment, with the purpose to defraud his creditors; and if he should do so, he should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

Attest, Taking The

1778 ART. 1. After much reflection, in the fear of the Lord, it has been concluded in union, that the brethren who have taken the attest should recall it before a justice, and give up their certificate, and recall and apologize in their churches, and truly repent for the error. If they can not do this, and will justify themselves, the apostle exhorts us we should withdraw ourselves from every brother who walketh disorderly, and such a brother will be deprived of the kiss of fellowship, of the council, and the breaking of bread, until he becomes obedient again. Ministers and elders who have taken the attest, and are very sorry and grieved for it, confessedly recall the matter before the justice of the peace, and in the public church, counsel shall be held about them in their churches in presence of one or more ministers or overseers to consider, in the fear of the Lord, whether he or such as before mentioned could serve again in their office. But if such minister or elder should approve himself stubbornly, and justify his course, yea, even teach the same, then we can not comprehend how he can be obedient to the Spirit of Truth, which teaches we shall not touch the unclean thing, nor be unequally yoked together with unbelievers, because Christ has no concord with Belial. Therefore, we decide that such laborers are unfit in the Lord's vineyard, and also unfit to be members in the church of the living God,, until their minds are changed, and they speak again with new tongues, or find their hearts with David. May God have mercy upon us!

1779 ART. 1. On account of taking the attest, it has been concluded in union as follows: Inasmuch as it is the Lord our God who establishes kings and removes kings, and ordains rulers according to his own good pleasure, and we can not know whether God has rejected the king and chosen the state, while the king had the government; therefore we could not, with a good conscience, repudiate the king and give allegiance to the state. And it seems to us that those who have done so have committed a fault, on account of which fault we could not break bread with them, but bear with them in love. But, if they would come moved by their own conviction, and would make acknowledgments, being truly repentant, then we might forgive them, and we believe God would also forgive them, and we might break bread with them. But in regard to the laborers (ministers), we think they should stand still in their labor, and not baptize or administer in the breaking of bread. Should they, however, come convinced in themselves to have erred, and show contrition, saying, "We are sorry," then we might forgive them, and be in full fellowship with them, yet, so that the church to which he belongs is satisfied with him, when he should continue in his office. But if such go still further in this matter, as holding office (political) and so forth, show no sorrow, and rather continue in such course, then they should be also deprived of the church council and holy kiss, and **nota bene,** not only the ministers, but all who have taken this course.

Auctioneering

1837 ART. 5. If a brother is at liberty to serve as cryer or clerk of public vendues? It is the counsel of the meeting, that no brother should take the liberty to cry at vendues, because it is unbecoming for a brother so to serve. As to the clerkship at vendues, it could not be considered quite so unbecoming, yet so that brethren ought to refrain from such things as much as possible.

1913 ART. 3. Inasmuch as there is some difference among the offending members on the query, Article 5, 1837, on sale crying, will not the Yearly Meeting of 1913 give a more scriptural answer on sale crying? Answer: We, your sub-committee, agree that article 5, 1837, Minutes of the Annual Meetings, is in line with the Spirit of the Scriptures. See Matt. 5. 16; 1 Cor. 10. 32; 1 Thess. 5. 2. Passed.

. Authority of Bishops

1822 ART. 6. How far should a brother keep house without counseling the church, or members without counseling the housekeeper? It was considered, that the brother who is housekeeper should always act in concert with the church, especially with his co-laborers in the church, and just so his co-laborers should always counsel with their elder brother, and a private brother should not undertake to teach or serve until the church calls him to it.

1846 ART. 4. Is there, in the churches of the brethren, any material difference among the bishops, so that one has more power than another? Considered, that according to the word of our Savior (Matt. xxiii. 8), "One is your master, even Christ: and all ye are brethren," there is no difference in the brotherhood or among bishops but that which a higher age and more wisdom and experience may give. See I. Pet. v. 5: "Ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder."

1848 ART. 20. Whether three or more ordained elders have the authority of liberating, out of avoidance, independent of the church? Considered, that it can not be done properly without the counsel and consent of the church.

1849 ART. 36. Has a bishop authority to request a deacon, who moved into his church without a letter of recommendation from the church from which he came, to take his place at a meeting for worship, and to preach or exhort? Considered, that he has no such authority, and the members that move from one church into another, ought always to bring a certificate of their membership and standing.

1849 ART. 37. If a member commits an open fault in the world, has the overseer authority to send brethren to investigate the matter before counseling the church? Considered, that the overseer has the authority to do so.

1850 ART. 17. How is it considered, when a sister has an unbelieving husband, who gets drunk and abuses her, and tempts to kill her with an ax; she then leaves him and returns to her father, who then goes to the housekeeper in the church for advice, upon whose advice a bill of divorce is obtained? Considered, that a housekeeper has no right to give such advice, without counseling the church, neither has the sister a right to get divorced without such counsel. (See Matt. xix. 6—9; I. Cor. vii. 11.)

1865 ART. 53. If there is a council-meeting appointed in one arm of the church, has the elder of that district a right to invite another elder of another arm or district to come and assist him in his church, or must the elder of the church, in all such cases, first ask the congregation before he invites another elder to help him? Answer: We think it is advisable for the elder to consult the church, or at least his co-laborers.

1868 ART. 22. Is it in accordance with the order of the brethren for the standing committee of the Annual Meeting to appoint elders to preside over a district, without the knowledge or consent of said district? Answer: We think the standing committee has a right, under certain circumstances, to do so.

1869 ART. 18. How is it considered if the majority of a congregation decide against the decisions of the Annual Council, can the bishop of said congregation act with the minority of said church, and the decision of the Annual Meeting? Answer: He can, as the Annual Meeting is of higher authority than any one church.

1869 ART. 20. Has an elder, or elders, a right to busy themselves with the affairs of another church, and take accusing queries concerning it to the Annual Meeting, against the bishops and elders thereof, and that secretly? If not right, what course should be pursued with those that would do so, to the very great dissatisfaction of the church? Answer: There may be cases where they have a right to look up the affairs of another church. But it is wrong to accuse elders of a particular church anywhere secretly; and if they do, they should be admonished to desist.

1871 ART. 13. Would it not be in harmony with the Scriptures, and the councils of our brethren, when there is considerable difficulty in a church, and the cause of the Master suffers in consequence thereof, for the elders of the adjoining churches to visit said church and set things that are necessary in order? Answer: We consider it would be in harmony with the Scriptures, and the order of the brethren, to do so.

1879 ART. 10. Has the elder alone, or with part, or with all of the official council, the right to withhold any question from the church that is agitating some of the members, and thereby affecting the interest of the church? If not, what is to be done with such that do? Answer: When a congregation wishes to act on a matter that is in harmony with the decisions of the Annual Meeting, and which affects the interest of the church, the official members ought not, and can not, prevent it from coming before the church; and if they do, the congregation has the privilege of calling in adjoining elders to assist.

1880 ART. 27. Has any committee of elders a right, according to Paul's instructions to Timothy (I. Tim. v. 19), to receive accusations against an elder without witnesses? And if so, is it right for them, after going through an investigation of such accusations, and finding them unsustained, to drop the matters without asking anything of the accuser? Answer: No.

1881 ART. 18. Is it right for elders to go out of their state or state districts, ordaining elders without the consent of adjoining elders? Answer: Not right, and the general brotherhood will not recognize such proceedings.

1881 ART. 20. Is it according to the order of the Brethren and elders, or any other brethren, to hold secret or clandestine meetings for the purpose of circulating petitions, or for any other purpose? Answer: No; and brethren doing as above stated should fall into the judgment of the church.

1898 ART. 7. Inasmuch as Yearly Meeting of 1873, article 19, has considered that an elder has no right either to expel a member from the church, or to put him in avoidance, without the counsel of the church, we therefore ask Yearly Meeting of 1898 what course to pursue with an elder or elders who put members in the avoidance by declaration instead of by voice of the church, as set forth in the above minute and accepted by the brotherhood as the established order of the church. Answer: We agree that said elder or elders did wrong, according to Matthew 18. 18. The church is to bind and to loose, and not the elders. Hence we conclude that such elder or elders should make satisfactory acknowledgment to the church where such offense was given, and promise to do so no more.

Automobiles

1909 ART. 5. Inasmuch as some of the members in our brotherhood are purchasing and using automobiles, and whereas they seem to be extravagant in price and for various other reasons give offense to some members throughout the brotherhood; and in view of the above grounds for offense and the undeveloped use of the automobile, we ask Yearly Meeting of 1909 to advise all the members not to purchase nor use them at all as our property under the present conditions, at least until such time (if ever) they may become inexpensive in price and in general use so that the Yearly Meeting in union can no more see a just cause for offense, and thus maintain not only a union in council but also in practice through our brotherhood. We pray the Yearly Meeting of 1909 to grant the above request. Answer: This Yearly Meeting grants the above request.

1912 ART. 1. Part First—Seeing there is a growing tendency among many of our brethren to avail themselves of the use of the automobile, and by such course have caused and are causing a division of sentiment in different congregations insomuch that some housekeepers are at a loss to determine what is best to do for the good of Zion and peace within her bounds. For this cause we pray this Yearly Meeting to again consider the propriety of our members using the automobile, and to more fully advise and explain the former minute upon the subject.

Part Second—Will this Yearly Meeting determine definitely whether the use of any kind of a vehicle driven by a motor engine subjects a brother or sister to expulsion from the church under our former minute upon the subject?

Second Query—We petition the Yearly Meeting of 1912 to inform us as to how she considers the auto-truck or freighting car. Shall they be held the same as the tourist car?

Answer to Part First—We, your sub-committee decide that Art. 5, of the minutes of Yearly Meeting of 1909, is in some degree indefinite and may be so used that the object sought for in the answer is evaded. For that cause we offer the following as a substitute: This Yearly Meeting can not see any propriety or consistency in our members owing or using the automobile either for pleasure or profit, and therefore strongly advises against it.

Answer to Part Second—But we see no cause for offense in the use of a vehicle for transporting freight when driven by a motor engine. Passed by the meeting.

1914 ART. 1. First Query—Inasmuch as the automobile question has been considered twice by Yearly Meeting, first in the year 1909, Art. 5, also in the year 1912, Art. 1, and yet, in view of all that Yearly Meeting has done by strongly advising our dear members against the impropriety and inconsistency of them owning or using the automobile, it does not seem to give satisfaction sought for, we therefore ask Yearly Meeting of 1914 to reconsider all of her former work on the automobile question and say instead thereof that this Yearly Meeting decides that no member be allowed to own an automobile, a truck car, or motorcycle, or to run one belonging to another person, they all being very unbecoming and inconsistent with the profession and life that should characterize the life of a true and humble follower of the Lord Jesus Christ according to the following Scriptures:

"Seekest thou great things for thyself? Seek them not." Jer. 45.5.

"Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." Matt. 5. 5.

"Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Matt. 7. 14.

"Then said Jesus unto his disciples, if any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me." Matt. 16. 24.

"That which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." Luke 16. 15.

"Be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable, and perfect will of God." Rom. 12. 2.

"Let your moderation be known unto all men." Phil. 4. 5.

"Abstain from all appearance of evil." 1 Thess. 5. 22.

"Be not deceived: God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Gal. 6. 7.

"Humble yourselves therefore, under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time." 1 Peter 5. 6.

"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." 1. Jno. 2. 15.

"As obedient, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance." 1 Pet. 1. 14.

Second Query—Inasmuch as the Yearly Meeting of 1912 has strongly advised against our members owning or using the automobile as their own property either for pleasure or profit, and therefore the church cannot allow them among the members. In view of the above we pray the Yearly Meeting of 1914 to say whether members may or may not own and use as their own property the auto-buggy or any other vehicle driven by a motor engine, that is designed for pleasure or profit as we have the auto-buggy among us.

Answer: We your sub-committee, in union agree on the automobile and auto or motor buggies and motorcycles, etc., and keenly realize the unpleasantness of handling the various auto spirits with the Gospel, yet we do not see how any help can come for such work by repealing former minutes on the automobile question; therefore, we reaffirm them, especially that part of the decision of 1909, Art. 5, which says, "Advise all the members not to purchase nor use them at all as our property under the present conditions, at least until such time (if ever) they may become * * * in general use, so that the Yearly Meeting in union can no more see a just cause for offense."

In regard to the auto-truck, we advise to make no change in the minutes of 1912, Art. 1, but advise members not to use them at all as a pleasure or passenger car under the present conditions or sentiments. Passed.

1916 ART. 1. We ask Annual Meeting of 1916 to remain firm in disciplining members who own, control, or ride in automobiles for novelty or luxury; and we also beg Annual Meeting to redeem her pledge made in 1909, Art. 5, and grant members the privilege to own, control and ride in automobiles when done for utility. Answer: We, your sub-committee, agree to accept the fore part of the above query, but also agree we cannot grant the liberty asked for in the latter clause of said query. But we feel to retain the decision of 1914, Art. 1, which we agree is in harmony with the Gospel, and should stop the agitation of the automobile question. Passed.

1919 ART. 1. We pray Annual Meeting to hold the automobile advice as we hold all other advices, and bring the unrest condition of our brotherhood to a close. See Minutes, 1865, Art. 34; 1872, Art. 5. Answer: All Annual Meeting advices are good and should be accepted alike until repealed by Annual Meeting.

1919 ART. 2. (1) Inasmuch as the ownership of automobiles and the operating of the same by many members of the church, has resulted in much confusion in our beloved Brotherhood; and whereas the decisions and advices hitherto reached by the A. M. have utterly failed to quiet the disturbed condition or to reestablish a broken peace in bleeding Zion; Therefore will not this A. M. of 1919 agree to reconsider Art. 5, of the minutes of A. M. of 1909 as well as all succeeding minutes upon the subject of automobile ownership and use, and instead thereof so advise that henceforth automobile ownership and the proper use thereof shall not militate against membership or any of the rights thereof? But, however, be it understood that all who indulge in the same, assume the responsibility of any wrong that may be connected therewith. However, members shall be held amenable to the church for proper economy and plainness as becometh children professing Godliness. We pray the A. M. of 1919 to grant the above.

(2) Whereas some of the members in nearly all parts of our beloved Brotherhood are using and operating automobiles, and whereas many members are feeling that the minutes of our A. M. are violated by members operating and purchasing automobiles our peace is much disturbed; Therefore will not this A. M. of 1919 agree to reconsider Art. 5, 1909, and all other minutes pertaining to automobiles, that peace and union may once more be attained, and now say that those who purchase and operate automobiles shall do so on their responsibility, shall have only such as are not extravagant in price, but plain, and shall handle them with much discretion and care, and shall be amenable to their respective congregations for any misuse of them?

(3) As unanimity has always been a distinct rule in our church government, and since our brotherhood is much disturbed on the automobile question, and there being no doctrinal point at issue, but a question of policy only, we ask this A. M. to lay the question down and stop the further agitation of the subject.

Answer: We, the Standing Committee, having had the above three several automobile queries thrown into our hands for answer, do agree to ask the Annual Meeting,

First—To reconsider all her advice on the automobile subject;

Second——To recognize the virtue of the said automobile advices in restricting members according to the practice of the churches up to this time;

Third—To decide that all members accepting this decision who have purchased automobiles, but have not been expelled, as well as elders who have encouraged them before A. M. agreed to bear with them, do by such acceptance, admit that they were too fast, and by so doing all offences will be removed, and peace and union restored:

Fourth—To decide that upon these conditions the A. M. now in union agrees, from henceforth, by the same authority that restricted the automobile, to bear with members buying as cheap and plain automobiles as they can get that will best suit their purpose for utility, by still being amenable to the local church for any misuse and abuse of them; and,

Fifth—to decide that members who have been expelled for owning or operating automobiles, desiring fellowship, shall be restored according to the general order; and thus may we be of one mind, and all speak the same thing, and work by the same rule as the one body of Christ. Passed.

1929 ART. 3. Inasmuch as there are still sincere convictions among at least some of us according to the Gospel and the Minutes in regard to the automobile in relation to the popular painting of the automobiles of the members and especially elders; and in view of these sincere convictions we ask this Yearly Meeting to define and condense more clearly all the minutes on that question in a revised form so as to be clearly understood by which all the means may be unitedly executed against this evil everywhere in our Brotherhood, and to make it the duty of all elders and ministers to faithfully admonish and advise against this growing evil.

Answer: We would advise our elders and housekeepers to strongly admonish all of our members to adhere to the minutes that we have, and not have automobiles that are painted with flashy colors but with a plain color consistent with our profession. Passed.

Avoidance

1794 ART. 1. Concerning the ban, we would very readily deny ourselves so much for our brethren's sake, so as to drop the Jewish word "ban." But the ordinance of the Lord Jesus and his holy apostles we can not give up, even for our brethren's sake, namely: "If any man that is called a brother is a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner: with such a one no not to eat." I. Cor. v. 11. Here we see clearly that Paul does not mean only the eating in (the Lord's Supper, but all eating (in his company). This is shown in the foregoing verse very plainly, when it says, "Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world," etc. Otherwise we might eat the bread of communion with the fornicators of this world, which certainly he can not have meant at all.

1805 ART. 1. Concerning those who are in avoidance. Since some think that we may or should not even give them the hand, while others would feel disposed at times to offer them the hand as a token that we would willingly assist them to be released and reconciled again, the unanimous conclusion was, that we should be of one mind, and follow the same rule in housekeeping, and it was so laid down, that it might be best to offer them in that view the hand, but to have no dealings with them nor any familiar intercourse until a reformation takes place in them.

1822 ART. 5. When a member is put in avoidance, how far is his companion in wedlock to be held as a member? It was considered, that she may be held as a member, yet so as not to break the bread of communion.

1825 ART. 3. Concerning separation or excommunication, being viewed of unequal degrees. It was considered, that according to apostolic doctrine, such having committed gross or vicious sins, must be put entirely in avoidance, while less transgressions only precluded from the kiss, brotherly counsel, and the breaking of bread.

1827 ART. 2. About the avoidance and restoration of members. When a member, on account of crimes committed, must be separated and put in avoidance, and should afterward become reformed in life and conduct, and apply for restoration or for release from the avoidance, and the church could not yet feel satisfied to restore such entirely, they might be released; and should such fall again into crime, we would have a right to put them again in avoidance.

1837 ART. 6. Whether the sense of the words of the Savior (Matt. xviii), "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican," is the same as the sense of the apostle, when he says (I. Cor. v.), "Have no company with him," etc. It is understood by the meeting almost unanimously, that the expression of the Savior, "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican," excludes a member only so far as from the church-council, from the kiss and the breaking of bread; but that it is the sense of the apostle, when he speaks of the vicious, "Have no company with him, and after noticing the vices adds yet, "with such a one (you ought) no not to eat," that we ought to avoid such a one altogether according to the sense of the word.

1838 ART. 1. Whether a congregation has the right, according to the gospel, to put a member in avoidance or not? Considered, that the old brethren always have thought it right, and still think it right, according to the gospel, to put members in avoidance in accordance with the word of the apostle, I. Cor. v. 9-11.

1840 ART. 3. In case one that was a brother, and now is held in avoidance, lives at a distance of several hundred miles from a brother to whom he is owing, and writes back to brethren he would be willing to pay if he knew how much; whether the latter would have liberty to write to the former how much he owed him? Considered, that brethren might state and send such accounts, as it was always permitted to settle old accounts with such members, that are held in avoidance.

1840 ART. 4 About the difference among the brethren in regard to avoidance — since, as it seems, some know or observe nothing at all of an avoidance; others take the liberty to eat with or to greet as brethren those that are put into avoidance, which with those who feel themselves in duty bound, according to the word, to observe entirely the avoidance, often times causes temptations and great oppression. Considered, that it is very much to be lamented that such a difference hath crept in by degrees among the brethren in such a highly important matter, and that it ought to be the ardent desire and the serious endeavor of all the brethren and members, and particularly of the elders and teachers, in observing this evangelic and apostolical ordinance again to come to a perfect unanimity.

1842 ART. 1. Whether the sense of the words of our Savior (Matt. xviii.), "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican," is the same with the expression of Paul the apostle, when he says, "Have no company with him." I. Cor. v. This same query had been before the yearly meeting in Virginia in the year 1837, and a similar one before the annual meeting in Morrison's Cove in the year 1840, and even in the year 1794 (almost fifty years ago) the brethren expressed their sense on the subject, which was read, and the brethren now assembled generally agreed to the then expressed views, desiring with our departed brethren that our dearly beloved brethren would seek to hold fast to the written word of truth, for we fear with them that whosoever will depart from it is in great danger to be deceived in these much confused times. Now he that attends strictly to the word will see plainly that in Matt. xviii. quite another case is mentioned than in I. Cor. v. There the Savior speaks of sins and offenses which a brother or sister may commit against a fellow-member. Here the apostle treats of vices and crimes which may be committed against God and the truth. And as there is a difference in the sins, even so is also a difference in the discipline. Already, under the law, there were some sins unto death, where the sinner had to die without mercy under two or three witnesses. Heb. x. 28. But some sins were not unto death, and could be atoned for by offerings and sacrifices. Even so there is a difference in the discipline under the gospel, as we may planily see from those passages before alluded to, viz., Mart. viii. and I Cor. v., if we examine them more closely. Therefore, the brethren have always considered, and we yet consider, that the divine sense requires to disown a member who will not be told unto when it has been overtaken in a fault, which might have been atoned for by an acknowledgment, for his refusing to acknowledge, only so far as from the church council, from the breaking of bread, and from the kiss. But a member that has fallen into gross sins and vices should be dealt with according to the word of God, as expressed by the Apostle Paul, viz., "Not to keep company with such a one, no, not to eat."

1843 ART. 5. When a brother is put into avoidance, according to the words of Paul (I Cor. v.), and his wife and children, being members in the church, have company with him, as it happens in a family, how the church hath to treat them, or whether there is a difference between the wife and the children, who are yet under the lawful age; and how we are to do when there is a difference of opinion about the withdrawing of the hand from those that are in avoidance? Considered, though we are always truly sorry when such a case occurs, where we must put a member into avoidance, and feel sincere compassion for those that suffer immediately under it, yet we can not set aside this apostolic ordinance, and do really believe that the more strictly it is observed by all the members, and especially by the nearest relations, the more powerful it would operate to the salvation of the fallen member; but in case a wife could not withdraw from fellowship with the husband to be avoided, it was always considered that such a member could not break the bread of communion while so doing, and we do conceive that children are in the same predicament, either to withdraw fellowship with the parent in avoidance or not to break bread; and in regard to withdrawing the hand, it was considered that when the church concludes to withdraw even the hand, the members should all unite in observing the same.

1844 ART. 8. In case where man and wife are both members, and it so happens that the church would have occasion to hold one or the other in avoidance, and after being held thus, say two or more years, without manifesting any fruits of sincere repentance, which would be the most prudent course to take in behalf of the companion of such thus held in avoidance? Considered, that though we sincerely pity the innocent party, if there has no change taken place in the state of the fallen member, there can be no change in the course of the church toward such a member. But of this, each church must judge according to existing circumstances. (See II Cor. ii. 5.

1846 ART. 6. Whether one that is called a brother, and has committed any gross crime, such as drunkenness, blasphemy, fornication, etc., can continue to be a member in the body of Christ, if he confesses his fault and promises to do better; whether the church may forgive him, or whether he ought not to be expelled, until he shows forth fruits meet for repentance? Considered, that though we can conceive of extraordinary cases of such total contrition of heart, similar to that kind of leprosy (see Levit. xiii. 12-17) which broke out abroad in the skin, and the leprosy cover all the skin of him that hath the plague, from his head even to his foot, and where the priest was to consider him clean; and so the church, likewise, may unanimously feel satisfied with such signs of genuine repentance, and may be willing to forgive at once on his full confession, yet in most cases it is the safest way, in the first place to obey the instruction of the Apostle Paul (I. Cor. v.), and to excommunicate such a member with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

1848 ART. 11. (Special Council). When the church disowns a member, so that it is set back from the salutation of the kiss, and from church fellowship, how is the proper way to do with such members as come from other arms of the church, and, knowing the standing of such disowned members, yet will still hold fellowship with such? Considered, that, inasmuch as the church of Christ is one body, all over the world, and the Word even says, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosened in heaven," if one branch of this church disowns a member, members from other branches, knowing this, should hold them equally as disowned.

1848 ART. 18. Whether we have any authority for liberating a person out of the avoidance, without the person making application? Considered, that there is, to our knowledge, no such authority, in the gospel.

1849 ART. 27. To how great a degree must a brother sin, and be degraded, before the church can put him in avoidance, acocrding to the gospel; and whether all dealings and communications, of a temporal nature, between such an individual and the members of the church, should cease? Considered, that this subject has been often before the Yearly Meeting, and the views of the brethren then were read. But on the particular points of the present query, we would refer our dear brethren to the word of God, which is plain, explicit, and sharper than a two-edged sword. Paul the apostle, says (Rom. xv. 4): "Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning;" and he evidently refers, in these words, to the writings of the Old Testament. Now, we find (Levit. v. 17): "If a soul sin, and commit any of these things, which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord; though he wist it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity, and he shall bring a trespass-offering unto the priest, and it shall be forgiven him." From this we may learn, that when a member has trespassed against God and the truth, even in ignorance, it is his duty to come to the church, and bring his trespass-offering, such as David says (Psalm LI. 17): "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise;" and the church, which, according to I. Pet. II. 9, is "a royal priesthood," is to judge, and receive his offering, and forgive him accordingly. Here are the words of Christ Himself, duly to be considered: "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." John xx. 23, etc. Should, however, such a member, that hath trespassed, be not willing to bring his offering of acknowledgment of his fault, not be willing to hear the church, then we may consider this as a rising, a scab, or bright spot, which eventually, may turn into moral leprosy (Levit. xiii. 2), and in this case the priest (the church) had to shut him up; for, as Paul says (II. Thess. iii. 6): "Now we command you, brethren in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly," etc.; and as our Lord taught us (Matt. xviii. 17): "If he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." This withdrawing, or shutting up, from close communion with the church, in the salutation of the kiss, the breaking of bread, and the secret council, is continued until it appears, to the satisfaction of the priest (the church), whether that spot is leprosy or not. Now if, on examination, the priest found that white spot somewhat dark, and that the plague did not spread in the skin, he was to pronounce him clean. So, when a member begins to see and acknowledge his fault, as somewhat dark, he may be reinstated again into full communion. "But when the raw flesh appeareth in him, and the leprosy is thus confirmed [N. B.—He shall not be shut up, for he is unclean], and the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and his head bare, and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip, and shall cry, Unclean, unclean; he shall dwell alone, without the camp shall his habitation be." Levit. xiii. 10, 45, 46. So our ancient brethren considered, when the moral leprosy in a member was confirmed by raw works of the flesh, such as are described (I. Cor. v. 11; Gal. v. 19-21, etc), that the direction of the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of the Apostle Paul, was to be strictly and literally obeyed, viz.: "**Not to keep company, and with such an one not to eat.**" Our brethren were well aware of some commentators explaining these words, as if they meant only not to have fellowship with such in spiritual matters, and not to eat with them the bread of communion. But they (our brethren) found it impossible to believe, that the church at Corinth should have continued, in full fellowship, such a person as is described (I Cor. v. 1); that they should have still broken the bread of communion with him, etc., even until the apostle reproved them by this epistle. They (the brethen) also thought of the awful words (Rev. xxii. 18, 19), and so they adhered simply to the word, as it reads, had no intercourse, no dealings of any kind, with such persons, and did not eat with them at the same table, or out of the same dish, at any common meal, while they were in this state of avoidance. Only acts of charity toward them our brethren did not consider prohibited by the word of God. And these views we still hold, in communion with our departed brethren.

1850 ART. 20. If a member commits a fault, whether the church has the power, according to the gospel, to put that member in avoidance without the assistance of another church?

Considered, that if there is a bishop in that church, they have the power in the case of a private member.

1850 ART. 24. Can a member that is cut off, and kept in avoidance, be afterward released again from the bonds of excommunication, without acknowledging the fault, or without coming and requesting to be released; and in case members are released without confessing their fault, or desiring to be released, how shall other members conduct themselves toward them?

Considered, that, where a member has committed one of those faults mentioned by the Apostle Paul (I. Cor. v.), and has been put in avoidance, the church having sufficient evidence that he has ceased from those evils, and by his earnest request, he may be released out of the bonds of avoidance.

1850 ART. 33. Whether members, who have been put in avoidance, can be released without their request? Considered, that they can not.

1850 ART. 35. If a brother transgress, so as to be deemed guilty of avoidance, should he not be cited to appear before the church, in the presence of the witnesses, to hear the testimony given? Considered, that he ought to be particularly requested to attend.

1850 ART. 37. If it is proven, by two or three brethren, that a brother has been drinking to excess, yet not so much as to disable him from keeping on his feet, but has often before been charged, and also before been set back or put in avoidance, and still denies the charge, would he not come under the class of drunkards, or would it be prudent to hold him as a brother, or should he be expelled by the proof of four or five witnesses, though not members of the church? Considered, that no member should be put in avoidance without positive proof, from members, that he or she has been guilty of one of those sins mentioned by Paul (I. Cor. v. 11).

1850 ART. 38. Have we a sufficient right, according to the gospel, to put a man in avoidance who has already been put back from the kiss, the communion, and the council, and disowned as a brother? Considered, that the church has the power to do so.

1855 ART. 2. How is it considered, if a young brother and sister want to marry each other, and being opposed by their parents (members, too), accomplish their design so late as to bring reproach upon themselves and the church? Considered, that the young members should be dealt with according to the circumstances, so as to prove that the church is not participating in evil, and that the parents should also be admonished, if the church finds them in error.

1856 ART. 3. If members commit gross sins, such as fornication, etc., and there is no ordained brother in such district, and the church sends to the nearest adjoining districts for ordained brethren, who, with the full consent of the church, place such members under the ban or avoidance, as the apostle saith, "not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator," etc. (I. Cor. v. 11), and afterward the oldest minister of such church turns round and tells the members, and even those who were placed in avoidance, that the brethren had no authority or right to do so, and by so doing creates considerable uneasiness in the church? Considered, that such a brother has done wrong, and that he should be corrected.

1858 ART. 5. Is it required of those who are so unfortunate as to have their companions put in avoidance, not to accompany with them as man and wife? Considered, that as the apostle says we are not to eat with them, we think his prohibition is sufficient.

1862 ART. 13. How is it considered if a church did, some years ago, in presence of two ordained elders, put in avoidance a member, having committed one of those sins mentioned in I. Cor. v. 11, and at a later date the same church did decide a similar case differently, by a strong majority, in opposition to one ordained elder and the housekeeper in the church? Answer: Inasmuch as Brethren Henry Kurtz and Jacob Snyder have taken this matter in hand, we leave it to those brethren to come to a union with the church concerned.

1864 ART. 12. What is to be done with a person, who, after being dismissed from the church, rails against the brethren, and speaks evil of them? Answer: We think he should be dealt with according to I. Cor. v. 11: "Not to keep company with such a one; no, not to eat."

1865 ART. 32. How does this meeting consider that part of I. Cor. v., which treats on "avoidance," as practiced by some of our churches? Referred to the next Annual Meeting.

1866 ART. 33. Will the Annual Meeting inform what course to pursue in the following case: A member is put in avoidance, and an elder from another state, knowing it, visits, salutes with the kiss, and eats with the avoided person; and when he is told that in doing so he has grieved the brethren, he threatens the church or district. Answer: We consider that the church aggrieved should select a committee of three ordained elders, who shall notify the offending elder of the time and place of meeting, and then investigate the case, and dispose of it according to their judgment. And we decide that an elder has no right to disrespect the action of another church in this manner. If a church should do wrong, it should be proceeded against in the regular gospel manner.

1867 ART. 9. If a member of a certain church is put in avoidance, how should members of those churches that can not see that avoidance is necessary hold such that are put in avoidance? Answer: The adjoining churches, and members of adjoining churches, are to hold them as such, and also avoid all speaking against avoidance to the avoided one.

Bailship For Criminals

1848 ART. 4 (Special) How should it be considered, if a man be put in the county prison for safe keeping until court, and a brother goes his security for appearance, and release him out of prison? Considered, that a brother ought not to meddle with such matters without church counsel.

1893 ART. 3. Inasmuch as we are sometimes solicited to sign petitions for the release of persons who have been convicted of crime, and are held by the law as convicts in our state prisons, we ask the counsel of this meeting, whether members should sign such instruments or writings. Answer: We deem it not safe to meddle with cases above referred to, for if the law of our land is violated we should not interfere, according to I Tim. I. 9, 10.

Banking

1849 ART. 10. Is it proper for members of the church of Christ to take stock in railroad or similar companies—such as bank, stock, etc.? Considered, as the stock of incorporate companies, only, and not the individual property held by the stockholders, is responsible for debts incurred by the company, and as the business of such companies is often much involved in obcurity, and persons dealing with such companies may be liable to be deceived, brethren had better not engage in such investments.

1860 ART. 8. Inasmuch as in the minutes of 1849, tenth query, the stock of railroads and banks are coupled together, we desire the Annual Meeting of 1860 to consider each subject separtely, and to give an answer to each. Answer: We advise brethren not to invest their money in bank stock at all, and would advise them to be cautious of all incorporated companies.

1871 ART. 9. Is it in accordance with the gospel for brethren to belong to the building and loan associations now organized in different parts of the country? Answer: We advise the brethren not to unite with such associations until they understand them properly, and are satisfied that uniting with them does not conflict with the gospel.

1872 ART. 21. Will this meeting allow brethren, and especially ministering brethren, to engage in the banking business? Answer: Not advisable for brethren to engage in such business. (See Matt. VI. 3)

1874 ART. 6. Inasmuch as the answer to Art. 21, of the minutes of 1872, in reference to brethren engaging in the banking business is considered indefinite, and as some take advantage of this circumstance and do engage in the business, will not this district-meeting request the Annual Meeting to reconsider said query, and give a more positive answer? We agree to ask the Annual Meeting for a reconsideration of said query. Answer: We, according to the above request, are willing to reconsider the query alluded to; but we do not see our way clear to make any decision more positive than we have already made. But we would admonish brethren to be very careful in engaging in all kinds of business, and especially in business done by incorporated bodies, such as railroads and banking companies, since by so doing they may be brought into dangerous associations with ungodly men.

1875 ART. 13. Will this district-meeting ask the Annual Meeting to adopt suitable measures to enable the church to cooperate actively with the peace association of America? Answer: Our church itself being a peace association, we need not, as a body, co-operate with others, but we may, as individuals, give our influence in favor of peace.

1893 ART. 2. Inasmuch as the matter of incorporated joint stock companies is becoming more prevalent, and it has become apparent that in some parts of the brotherhood our members take stock and become members of such companies, and by so doing are bound by the laws governing such associations, and in case the civil law is put in force by said companies or associations to sustain any action, whether against a member in fellowship or otherwise, it would be contrary to the gospel and the advice of the Yearly Meeting. (See Minutes.) We therefore pray that this Yearly Meeting advise all the elders and housekeepers who may have the oversight of any local church, to see that the advice or decision, relative to this matter, be carried out; and in case it comes to the knowledge of elders in any part of the brotherhood that said advice is not respected and carried out, it becomes their duty to see as above stated, that the former advice is respected, which is in harmony with their duties as set forth when called to the eldership. Answer: The above request and advice unanimously passed the meeting.

1921 ART. 1. We ask this Annual Meeting the following questions: 1st. Should brethren purchase stock in incorporated companies? 2nd. Will not this Annual Meeting reconsider the present plan of publishing The Vindicator? 3rd. Can a brother fill the position of a director in any incorporated stock company, such as banks and manufacturing industries? As our brethren strongly advise our dear members not to invest in such stocks. See Art. 10, A. M. 1849. Answer: To first and third parts of query, No, and recommended that minutes of 1893, Art. 2, be carried out. To second part of query, No. Passed.

Baptism

1804 ART. 7. About persons who are among the English Baptists, and have been baptized by them, and come now and desire to be admitted (in our church); whether they ought to be baptized again, according to the true order of baptism, or if they should prefer it, whether we would receive them without being baptized again? In consideration of the Scripture, and especially because the Lord said to Moses, "Look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount" (Exod. xxv. 40), it has been concluded, with one accord, that when such come to us we should give them in all things good instruction according to the gospel—yea, according to the Scriptures; and when they believe, and are willing to obey from the heart that form of doctrine according to the counsel of God, they ought to be baptized in the proper order, because there have occurred different examples that heretofore persons had been received by the brethren who thought then they could be satisfied with their single backward immersion, but afterward they were more enlightened, have deemed their baptism as imperfect, and to put their conscience at rest, they requested and had to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a trine immersion.

1821 ART. 6. Whether members (persons) might be received into the church, who have been but once immersed (without baptizing them in the manner we believe it ought to be done according to the gospel)? It was considered, that a threefold immersion is the true baptism; but if such persons would be content with their baptism, and yet acknowledge the Brethren's order as right, we would leave it over to them, and receive them with the laying on of hands and prayer.

1828 ART. 6. Whether a person may be received into the church, having been immersed but once? It is the counsel to be better that they should be baptized again in the true order.

1828 ART. 7. Whether we had a right to cause a candidate for baptism to make a vow? It was considered, that it is according to the gospel to receive them in the order of the Brethren as usual.

1833 ART. 1. Whether we are to immerse at baptism once or thrice. It was considered, that we can not deem any other baptism as valid, according to the word of God, but a threefold immersion.

1834 ART. 4. Whether we could receive into our church a person that has been immersed once backward, without baptizing him again? Considered, that though it has been done before still we believe that the best and safest way is to baptize them right, and according to the proper order (as we believe), and that hereafter it should not be done otherwise.

1835 ART. 11. What is the order to receive applicants for baptism? It is necessary that there should be self-knowledge, repentance, and faith, together with scriptural instruction, and then that it may be done with the counsel of the church.

1837 ART. 8. When persons desire, to be received through baptism into the church, if it be necessary, to instruct them before baptism of the taking of oaths, going to war, and the like, that according to our view it is forbidden in the gospel? The advice is, that such persons ought, if possible, to be visited before their baptism, and by all means to be previously instructed of the following points, viz.: Of the taking of oaths, going to war and to muster, to use the power of the law contrary to the gospel, and to conform to the fashions of this world in apparel and the like; and that they ought to state before their reception their willingness to refrain from all such things.

1844 ART. 4. In regard to the difference in the form of words, which the brethren use in baptism, it was, after a free discussion, considered, since in the practice of a threefold immersion of the kneeling candidate, and in the use of the words of our Savior (Matt. xxviii. 19). "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," we are all perfectly agreed, to lay the matter down as heretofore, and to bear with one another in love, yet so that the teachers in one and the same church or district, ought to use the same form. (See I. Cor. i. 10).

1844 ART. 10. How a brother is to proceed when application is made for baptism, in a place where there are no brethren to counsel with? Considered, that if a brother is authorized to baptize, and has taught them according to the gospel, and feels himself satisfied, he may proceed; but a brother who is not authorized to baptize, ought to inform other brethren, who have the authority to administer baptism. The Savior always sent his disciples by two and two. Mark vi. 7; Luke x 1, etc.

1845 ART. 1. In regard to the difference in the form of words which the brethren use in baptism, it was considered by the committee, to let this matter rest as it was laid down last year (see Art. 4), more especially since the brethren and churches are not generally represented as it would be desirable in such an important matter.

1848 ART. 3. How are we to receive members into the church, from their first application, until they are baptized according to the gospel? Considered, that inasmuch as there has been, hitherto, a difference in the practice, and in the form of words used in this ordinance; and inasmuch as it is desirable to be, in all such matters, of one mind, and do and speak the same things, this meeting has unanimously agreed upon the following course, and form of words, and recommend the same for adoption in all the churches:

First, the applicant to be examined by two or more brethren; then, the case to be brought before the church council, before whom the applicant is to declare his agreement with us, in regard to the principles of being defenseless, non-swearing, and not conforming to the world; then, in meeting, or at the water, to read from Matt. xviii, verses 10 to 22, in public, the candidates being asked if they will be governed by those gospel rules; then, prayer at the water, and in the water, the following questions to be asked:

Question: Dost thou believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that he has brought from heaven a saving gospel? Answer: Yea.

Question: Dost thou willingly renounce Satan, with all his perniicous ways, and all the sinful pleasures of this world? Answer: Yea.

Question: Dost thou covenant with God, in Christ Jesus, to be faithful until death? Answer: Yea.

Upon this, thy confession of faith, which thou hast made before God and these witnesses, thou shalt, for the remission of sins, be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. After baptism, while in the water, the administrator to lay his hands on the head of the candidate, and offer up a prayer to God in his behalf, and then the member is to be received, by hand and kiss, into church-fellowship.

1848 ART. 5. Ought we to receive any person into the church without baptism, having been baptized by any other order of people? Considered, that this Yearly Meeting advise to be very careful in this matter, and give it, as their unanimous conclusion, that it would be better to admit no person into the church, without first being baptized by the brethren.

1848 ART. 12. Can we receive a member into the church, by baptism, without a confession; and if not, what is that confession to be? Considered, that we can not receive a member into the church, by baptism, without a confession; and, what this is, see Art. 3.

1851 ART. 17. Whether the form of words used in the ordinance of baptism, as laid down at the Annual Meeting, A. D. 1848, could not be reconsidered? Considered, to leave it as the minutes of 1848 have it.

1855 ART. 6. Is it consistent with the gospel to receive persons into the church with hand and kiss, when circumstances will not permit baptism to be performed? Considered, that it is not according to the gospel to consider persons as members of the church without baptism; yet they should be encouraged, and, if they wish it, their cases may be taken into consideration by the church, in council, and they be received as candidates for baptism, which is to be performed as soon as circumstances will permit.

1855 ART. 26. How is it considered best to do with a brother, or brethren, that will not use the words, in administering baptism, as it was decided at the Yearly Meeting, near Wooster, Ohio, in 1848, "for the remission or forgiveness of sin?" Considered, that the decision of said council should be observed, as it was observed by many brethren from time immemorial, and those brethren, who will not submit to it, should be admonished, for love sake, and for the Word's sake, to comply.

1857 ART. 20. Do not those administrators of baptism, who make the candidates for baptism renounce all the world require too much of the candidates, since we all have more or less to do with the world? Would it not be more proper to require of them to renounce only what is contrary to the gospel? Answer: The third article of the minutes of 1848, contains the proper renunciation of the world. The passage in that article, referred to here, reads thus: "Dost thou renounce all the sinful pleasures of this world?"

1858 ART. 1. Can a person be received into the church who is uncle to his wife? Or, do the brethren think the gospel will not allow such a person becoming a member of the church? Considered, that if he is uncle to his wife by marriage, he may be received, if by blood relation, he should not.

1858 ART. 57. Can the brethren be in full communion with a brother or a communion of brethren, who do not hold a church council in receiving applicants for baptism, and who do not ask those who are baptized to renounce the devil and all the sinful practices of the world or flesh, and who do not practically follow the doctrine of self-denial? Considered, that we think such can not be in full communion with us. Acts x. 47; Prov. xv. 22; I. John ii. 15-17; Titus ii. 12.

1859 ART. 3. How is it considered if a minister would publicly teach that water baptism is not for the remission of sins, but that a person must have an evidence within that his sins are pardoned before he is a fit subject for baptism; and, also, would differ with brethren in the mode of electing brethren to the ministry, and likewise claims that all members, both male and female, have a right to admonish and exhort? Answer: Considered, that it is not according to Acts ii, 38, and xxii. 16, to teach that a person must have an evidence within that his sins are pardoned before he is a fit subject for baptism, and that we know of no better way for the brethren to elect their ministers than that which has been practical heretofore. And concerning members exhorting, without being authorized by the church, we think they should not do so in the church, in our public or general meetings, according to I. Cor. xiv. 33-35.

1859 ART. 5. Inasmuch as the ceremony used by the brethren, in receiving members into the church, is thought, by a large proportion of the brethren, to be of too great length, might it not be shortened? And, instead of the questions being asked in the water, would it not be more consistent to ask them in the house, or on the bank of the river or stream? Answer: We do not consider it good to make any alterations from the present practice of the brethren.

1860 ART. 4. Shall it be an order among the brethren to receive persons into the church, as members, when they are sick, without baptism, with the promise that they will be baptized when they get well? Answer: Let persons who wish to be received into the church, and who are too sick to have the ordinance of baptism administered to them, be considered candidates for baptism, to receive the ordinance as soon as circumstances will permit, but not in full membership until they are baptized.

1860 ART. 11. Is it consistent with the order of the brethren, and the gospel, to receive a member into the church without the counsel of the church, when it is practicable to have a council? Answer: It is not consistent.

1862 ART. 21. Would it not be better, instead of asking the consent of each individual member concerning the reception of an applicant, to make the request general, that is, ask the church as a body whether they are willing to receive such applicant, and if they are, let silence give consent; and if not, that member who is not willing to receive such applicant, shall have full privilege to state his or her objections? Answer: This is left optional to each arm of the church.

1862 ART. 27. A person was baptized, and thus became a member of the church; afterward thought he was not in the right state of mind when he had been baptized, and felt that if he would die in this state he would be lost, and then made application to be re-baptized. The brethren in the congregation tried to reconcile him, and could not, and also sent strange and elder brethren to talk with him, who also failed to satisfy him. After repeated and continued application for re-baptism, a brother, without the counsel of the church, baptized him over again, when he became reconciled. Now, did the brother who re-baptized the person do his duty? Answer: We think he did not do his duty, but did wrong.

1862 ART. 63. Will the brethren, in Annual Council, consider it right for ministering brethren to receive members into the church without requesting them to lay off the fashions of the world in regard to apparel, and to conform to the order of the brethren? Answer: We consider it would not be right to do so. (See Rom. xii. 2.)

1862 ART. 67. When a person, having received baptism in the same way that we perform it, but by a minister of a different denomination, wishes to be united to the brethren, must such a person be re-baptized in order to be received into our church? Answer: We refer to the minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1848. Art. 5.

1864 ART. 12. Inasmuch as there is still a difference of opinion relative to the applicant for baptism declaring his agreement with the church in regard to the principles of non-resistance, non-swearing, and non-conformity to the world, whether this should be done in the presence of the whole congregation, or of the church only, we wish a decisive answer, and not only a reference to the minutes of 1848 and 1858, as we have referred to these, but still get into difficulty. Answer: We think it should be done in the presence of the church only.

1864 ART. 17. Is it wrong to baptize or immerse sick persons in a house? Answer: We consider it is not advisable to do so whenever it is possible to avoid it.

1864 ART. 25. Is it in accordance with the gospel, and the order of the brethren, for the church to receive and take candidates in with (or by) hand and kiss previous to the reading of Matt. xviii., and then baptize them upon their public confession? Answer: We think it is neither in accordance with the gospel nor the order of the brethren to do so.

1864 ART. 28. Is it according to the gospel, and the order of the brethren, to receive and baptize into the church such as are in the military service, bearing arms in this war, or to go into the camps and baptize such, and let them remain in the service, or should they not first get a full discharge before they can be received into the church by baptism? Answer: We can not encourage such proceedings; but in case of extreme sickness, and when there is a promise to shed no more blood, we will let the churches applied to decide what shall be done; but let the principles of the church be acceded to by all candidates.

1866 ART. 8. A man was baptized by the brethren, but he afterward left the church, with the plea that he never believed there was a God, and that he joined the church for worldly gain; but afterward he wishes to join the church, and to be baptized, and says he now believes in Christ, and lives as becomes a Christian. Can he be received without being re-baptized? It was considered best to defer this question to the next Annual Meeting.

1867 ART. 8. When there are two places of meeting in a congregation, the elder attending at one place, and two other ministering brethren at the other, is it according to the gospel for a minister in the second degree to authorize a brother in the first degree to baptize, after counseling the members present, in the absence of the elder or bishop? Answer: We unanimously consider it consistent and valid, when authorized by a minister in the second degree and the members present.

1868 ART. 3. This query refers to Art. 8, of 1866, and relates to a brother who wished to be re-baptized. Answer: Inas much as we are informed that the case to which this article refers was disposed of in the church in which it occurred, we think it best to give it no further consideration at present.

1870 ART. 13. A sister was received into the church years ago by single immersion, but upon the agitation of the subject, the question arises, can she be retained as a member of the church? Answer: We consider that the gospel, and our consistency in regard to our practice of the gospel, require us to adhere strictly to our mode of immersion, as recognized in the minutes of our Annual Meeting. (See Minutes of 1841, Art. 5)

1873 ART. 3. Is it not sufficient, and according to the gospel, to ask the candidate for baptism, while in the water, the only question? Dost thou believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God? instead of using the words of the formula, found in the minutes of 1858, Art. 41? Answer: We think one question is not sufficient, and therefore make no change in our present practice.

1874 ART. 16. Inasmuch as the Savior says, "In secret have I said nothing," will the Annual Meeting decide that the churches may ask the applicant for baptism all the questions in the presence of the whole congregation? Answer: We think it best to make no general change from the order given in the minutes of 1848; neither do we think it necessary to make any change to meet the case of the question, since in the order of 1848, above alluded to, it is not said whether the questions shall be put publicly or privately, and so in particular cases it may be done publicly. But when there is no necessity of doing otherwise, let the questions, after the examination, be put to the candidate before the church alone, as is the general practice of the brotherhood.

1875 ART. 2. Is it according to the gospel for brethren to make a pool in a meeting house, for the purpose of baptizing? Answer: As we have no authority in the Scriptures for baptizing in the house, we consider it wrong to do so.

1877 ART. 19. Inasmuch as there is an increasing difference of opinion among the brethren relating to laying before our applicants for baptism the principles of **non-resistance, non-swearing,** and **non-conformity** to the world, some preferring to do this before the whole congregation, while others to do it before the church only, will, therefore, this Annual Meeting reconsider former minutes upon this subject, and grant to each district the privilege to act in this matter as the church with its surrounding circumstances may think best? Answer: We think it best to make no change from former decisions of Annual Meeting.

1877 ART. 27. Will this district meeting petition the Annual Meeting to re-adopt the answer of Annual Meeting, 1827, Art. 3, and also of Annual Meeting of 1838, Art. 13, so as to receive members of other denominations who have been baptized by a valid baptism, that is, by triune immersion? Answer: This Annual Meeting decides not to adopt the minutes alluded to in the query.

1877 ART. 29. A request from the Philadelphia Church asking Annual Meeting to reconsider Art. 2, of minutes of 1875. Therefore, we, the district meeting of Eastern Pennsylvania, send their request up for reconsideration. Answer: We decide to make no change from the minutes of 1875.

1877 ART. 30. How do we, the members of the Philadelphia Church that have been baptized in the pool or baptistry, stand in relation to the church at large; and does the church consider it a valid, Christian baptism? The above query was read and considered by the Philadelphia Church, and referred to district meeting. District meeting agreed to refer this query to Annual Meeting. Answer: We decide that those who were baptizd in the pool were baptized with a valid baptism and those who walk in the order of the gospel and the Brethren, are recognized as members of the church.

1878 ART. 11. To the Brethren in Annual Meeting assembled, greeting: We, the members of the Bush Creek Church, of Adams and Highland counties, of the State of Ohio, do ask of you, through our district meeting in southern Ohio, to allow us the privilege of asking all questions to applicants for baptism, before going into the water. Answer: We decide to make no change.

1880 ART. 7. Is it any violation of our Savior's law when members are to be received into the church to instruct them in the presence of the entire congregation, in all the principles of the gospel of the church understands them, and then ask such person whether they agree with the church in faith, if so, let them answer in the presence of the entire congregation, then proceed and take the council upon receiving them to find out whether there be any legal objection to receiving them, also in the presence of the entire congregation? Another question of similar import to this was presented, and the following answer was given: Answer: Referred to last query, or No. 6. And where there is any cause or reason of objection known, it shall be made privately, or before the church only.

1881 ART. 27. Is a person a legal member of the church, according to Acts viii. 17, and ix. 6, who had hands laid on him after baptism, out of the water? If so, we ask the brethren to reconsider and change the reading of the minutes of 1848, Art. 3, and 1858 Art. 41, so as to recommend to the different churches to follow the example of the apostles in the laying on of hands out of the water. Answer: Yes, but in regard to the latter part of the question, we answer that we make no change in the general order.

1881 ART. 28. Is it according to the gospel and apostolic precedent to practice the laying on of hands in prayer which follows baptism after the administrator and the party baptized come up out of the water? Answer: This question was deferred.

1882 ART. 7. Should we not have a uniform manner of interrogating applicants for baptism? Answer: We certainly should, and this meeting demands that the brethren all proceed in this case as laid down in the minutes of 1848, Art. 3, which reads as follows: How are we to receive members from their first application until they are baptized according to the gospel? Considered, that inasmuch as there has been hitherto a difference in the practice and in the form of words used in this ordinance; and inasmuch as it is desirable to be in all such matters of one mind, and do and speak the same things, this meeting has unanimously agreed upon the following course and form of words, and recommends the same for adoption in all the churches:

First, the applicant to be examined by two or more brethren; then the case to be brought before the church council before which the applicant is to declare his agreement with us in regard to the principles of being defenseless, non swearing, and not conforming to the world; then, in meeting or at the water, to read from Matthew xviii. 10-22 in public, the candidates being asked if they will be governed by those gospel rules; then, prayer at the water, and in the water the following questions to be asked:

Question: Dost thou believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that he has brought from heaven a saving gospel? Answer: Yea.

Question: Dost thou willingly renounce Satan, with all his pernicious ways, and all the sinful pleasures of this world? Answer: Yea.

Question: Dost thou covenant with God in Christ Jesus to be faithful unto death? Answer: Yea.

Upon this, thy confession of faith, which thou hast made before God and these witnesses, thou shalt, for the remission of sins be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. After baptism, while in the water, the administrator is to lay his hands on the head of the candidate and offer up a prayer to God in his behalf, and then the member is to be received by hand and kiss into church fellowship.

1883 SEC. 17. (Recon. Min.) Baptizing in house or pool not the ancient order. All decisions void. (Accepted.)

1884 SEC. 35. (Recon. Min.) Receiving Members into the church from their first application. We adopt Article 3, 1848. (Accepted.)

1921 ART. 2. First, inasmuch as Art. 5, A. M., 1902, is far reaching, we ask this A. M. of 1921, that it consider said article and say that we cannot receive into our fellowship any one that has been baptized by any other religious fraternity without their being re-baptized.

Second. We ask Annual Meeting to reconsider the minutes of 1882, Art. 5, 1890, Art. 1, 1908, Art. 5, and give an answer more in harmony with 1 Cor. 12:13, that all may understand alike and all practice alike, and not receive into church fellowship applicants baptized by other denominations, on their baptism. Answer: This Annual Meeting decides to grant the request of both the above queries, viz., that all minutes named therein be reconsidered, and says, We cannot receive into fellowship any that are baptized by any other organization from this date of passage, without rebaptism. See 1. Cor. 12:13. Passed.

1924 ART. 3 Inasmuch as the answer to queries Nos. 1 and 2, Art. 2, 1921, is not understood alike by all, therefore, we pray this Annual Meeting to reconsider the answer to the above named queries and drop the words: "From this date of passage," so as to make it more definite and that all may understand alike.

We further pray this Annual Meeting to make provision for certain cases in districts wherein no separation has taken place in our once united fraternity, allowing it to the discretion of local churches (in addition to advice of adjoining elders) whether or not to recognize baptism administered by Church of the Brethren: all such applicants for membership to be required to accept the Resolutions of August 24th, 1881. Answer: We agree to reconsider queries Nos. 1 and 2, Article 2, minutes of 1921 and answer to the same, and decide that all who were baptized before the general separation may be received into fellowship without rebaptism by accepting the Resolution of 1881 and the general principles of our fraternity. Further, All who have been baptized since the general separation must be received only by rebaptism. Passed.

Baptism of the Holy Ghost

1857 ART. 37. How is it considered when one brother preaches that there is no baptism of the Holy Ghost now, but that it is only the gift of the Holy Ghost which believers receive, while another brother prays for the Lord to baptize with the Holy Ghost? Answer: We think it best for no brother to preach that there is no baptism of the Holy Ghost now, but in praying we should pray for the gift of the Holy Ghost.

1900 ART. 6. Is it right, according to the Scriptures, for brethren to preach or advocate the doctrine that man is not born of the Spirit until and only through the resurrection of the body? And if not, what shall be done with brethren who do so? Answer: No, not in accordance with the Scriptures. See St. John 1. 12, 13; also 3. 5; Rom. 6. 3, 4, 5; I Peter 1. 22, 23. And brethren who do so should be admonished to do so no more and if they do, they should fall into the judgments of the church.

Beard

1804 ART. 5. Whether upon request a brother might be ordained as a bishop, who shaves off his beard; it was considered that inasmuch as God made man with a beard, and again God commanded his people in the law not to cut off the beard; and it was especially required by the priests of God not to mar the corners of the beard; and also Christ, our Master and precursor, together with his disciples, has left us an example herein, in consideration of these and other Scriptures and examples, it (the ordination) could not readily be done in a sound faith, and with an unoffended conscience.

1822 ART. 1. Whether a brother might be set forward to baptize and break bread who does not wear his beard; it was considered, that according to the image of God (in which man was created), and according to the image of Christ, we ought to (leave our beard undisturbed or) wear our beard (at least in part), and that no brother should be so far advanced who could not deny himself in this manner.

1846 ART. 11. How it is considered by this Yearly Meeting if brethren, who do not wear their beard, are to be advanced to administer baptism and the breaking of bread, or even are to be ordained? Considered, that we are much grieved; also, in this respect a deviation and want of self-denial is becoming apparent here and there, and that it would be well and laudable if we would not only keep in remembrance, but also put in practice, the example and advice of our beloved old brethren. In 1822 (twenty-four years ago), the query had been asked, "Whether a brother might be chosen to baptize and to break the bread of communion who does not wear his beard?" and was considered, according to the image of God (in which man was created), and according to the image of Christ, we ought to wear the beard; and that a brother should not be advanced so far, who could not deny himself in this respect." In 1804 (forty-two years ago), the query came up, "Whether, if it be required, we might ordain a brother, as a bishop, who shaves off his beard?" and was considered, that, "as God created man with a beard, and again, God commanded his people, in the law (of Moses), and especially the priests of God, not to cut off the beard, and also, Christ, our Master and our Example, together with His disciples, may become our pattern in this respect—in consideration of these and other Scriptures and examples, it could not well be done in a sound faith and with a clear conscience."

1853 ART. 7. How it is considered, when a brother lets his beard grow a while, and afterward cuts it off, or trims it according to the fashion of the world? The committee was of the opinion, that if a brother lets his beard grow, in honor of his profession, that he should not cut it off, nor, by any means, to trim it in conformity to the fashions of the world. (See Rom. xii.). This was adopted.

1854 ART. 19. How will it be considered if a brother, serving in the office of a deacon, does not let his beard grow, and when admonished, opposes, and asks Scripture on that question?

Considered, that the brethren should bear and forbear in love, and give him the best Scripture ground they can.

1862 ART. 12. How is it considered for brethren to wear the beard on the upper lip, they being conscientious in doing so? If a brother does not shave any, we would leave it with his conscience; but if he lets it stand on his upper lip only, we consider it wrong.

1869 ART. 14. How is it to be considered when a brother is conscientious in wearing his beard on his upper lip (a full beard), and when there are other brethren who are conscientious in not saluting such brethren? Answer: We consider that in all such cases as the foregoing, brethren should bear with one another.

1874 ART. 5. Since it is fashionable for the world to wear the mustache, the brethren are adopting it and claim for it liberty of conscience, saying that it is good for the eyes, are brethren compelled to salute such if they can not do it without doing violence to their conscience? Answer: Brethren should never wear a mustache only, or fashionable beard, according to the fashion of the world; and if they do, they will fall into the council of the church.

1882 ART. 6. Will the district meeting request the Annual Meeting to explain the clause in the resolutions, and say what is meant by "fashionable mustaches?" The district meeting grants the above request. Answer: We regard the term referred to as applying to the general worldly custom of wearing the beard on the upper lip, since it has become a general worldly fashion to do so. We advise in this case, as the old brethren have always done, that we refrain from all appearance of evil and pride and adhere to the order of the church, so as to give no offense to any of our dear members. (See also minutes of 1866, Art. 27.)

1928 ART. 2. We request the Annual Meeting to strongly advise brethren to wear the cape on the overcoat, also to wear the beard, as it seems we are losing out on these two points of church order, especially in some localities. Official brethren should set an example in all matters of non-conformity to the world, and adhere to the adopted uniform and order of the church. See Rom. 12:2; 1 Thess. 1:4 to 8; 1 Peter 5:1 to 4; and A. M. Min. 1888, Art. 1; 1900, Art. 5; 1913, Art. 2. Answer: We agree to readopt article 2, of 1913 with instructions to the elders to strongly admonish their local congregations on the cape overcoat and the beard. Passed.

Bells, Sleigh

1840 ART. 7. About the more and more increasing evil, that members conform so much to the world in building, house furniture, raiment, etc., and even to have a string of bells upon their horses at sleighing? Considered, that all the brethren and members, and especially teachers, ought to oppose and labor against this growing evil, and to avoid the tinkling of bells as improper for brethren.

1856 ART. 11. Is it becoming for a brother, especially an ordained brother, to have strings of bells on his horses, in sleighing? Considered not becoming, unless where it is required by law to prevent accidents, and can not be avoided.

Bells On Meeting Houses

1859 ART. 25. In case brethren put a bell on their meeting-house, will their course be approved by the Yearly Meeting? Answer: This Annual Meeting can not approve of brethren doing so.

1862 ART. 8. Is it wrong for brethren to put bells on their meeting-houses? Answer: We do not think it advisable to encourage brethren to have bells on their meeting-houses.

1865 ART. 54. Inasmuch as there is a difference of opinion, and some aggrievance, in regard to bells on church houses, we wish the Annual Meeting to decide the matter. Answer: Decided not to have them.

1866 ART. 29. Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting has decided that bells on meeting-houses, giving offense, is wrong, does this Annual Meeting say that bells on meeting-houses in towns or cities (though of great advantage) should be taken down, or should they be regarded as lightning-rods, dinner bells, and like things, giving like offenses? And if not so regarded, will this Annual Meeting give gospel grounds for not admitting church bells on meeting-houses in towns or cities? Answer: We think it best for brethren to be subject to the decision of the Annual Meeting, and if reconciliation can not be made, it would be best to take them down, according to Romans xiv. 15-21, and avoid giving offense.

1884 SEC. 25. (Recon. Min.) Bells Upon Our Meeting Houses. We adopt the minutes of 1859, Art. 25, also 1865, Art.54, whose advice is, "Have None."

Benediction

1849 ART. 2. Is it in accordance with the gospel for a brother to call the meeting to rise upon their feet, after worship is concluded with singing and prayer, and then, with uplifted hands, pronounce a blessing over them? Concluded, that it should not be.

1851 ART. 3. A query, whether it is right for brethren to dismiss the congregation, by pronouncing a blessing over the people? Considered, that inasmuch as we have neither command, nor example, from our great High Priest and his apostles, of pronouncing a blessing upon the people, and inasmuch as preachers are as needy of blessings as their hearers, for which we ask in our prayers, after sermon, we would deem it more unassuming, and more agreeable to humility, to follow the footsteps of our ancient brethren, as they followed Christ.

1862 ART. 53. Is it in accordance with the gospel to pronounce a benediction over the people at the close of a funeral service at the grave? And if so, what should be the form? Answer: We have no authority in the gospel for doing so, and no such custom among the brethren to sanction it.

Bicycles

1896 ART. 1. Inasmuch as the modern invention and use of the bicycle is becoming very popular in the world, and is slyly creeping into the church, thereby endangering our nonconforming principles. Can not this Yearly Meeting give a definite answer to the following question: Is it according to the life and teachings of Christ and allowable by the church for her members to own or use bicycles? Answer: Inasmuch as bicycles are highly esteemed among men, we advise our members not to own or use bicycles, according to the Savior's language in Luke xvi. 15, and Romans xii. 2.

Bishops or Elders

1821 ART. 1. Whether an ordained brother may collect debts by the power of the law? Considered, that no brother, much less one that is ordained, has a right to do so according to gospel doctrine, neither for himself nor for another.

1836 ART. 5. When a bishop is old and too feeble to serve in his office fully as he ought, whether (the church) have a right to select another? The counsel is, to go to counsel with the nearest churches, and if looking on the proposition favorably, and the old bishop and his church would be of one mind, then it might be done.

NOTE—See under Beard; also under Authority of a Bishop.

1846 ART. 2. (Special Council) How is it considered for a bishop, with a few members, to expel a member without taking the council of the church? Considered, that in all such important matters the church must be counseled.

1846 ART. 4. (Special Council) Whether a deacon can be ordained to the office of bishop? Considered, that we have no authority for so doing. (See I. Tim. iii. 10, and v. 22.)

1849 ART. 9. What is the duty of a bishop toward his church, and the duty of the church toward the bishop or bishops? In case a bishop commits an error, is it to be overlooked more in him than in another brother in office, or a private member? Considered, that elders that rule well, should be counted worthy of double honor, and that overseers should not undertake any thing of importance without counsel of the church, and if there should be a general complaint of the church against him, he is to acknowledge his fault before the church, like another member, and should not be spared; for "if the eye be evil, the whole body shall be full of darkness." Still, it was always the advice of our old brethren, that, in any case where laboring brethren were in a fault, strange and impartial brethren of experience, should be called to assist in the investigation and justification of the same.

1849 ART. 36. Has a bishop authority to request a deacon, who moved into his church without a letter of recommendation from the church from which he came, to take his place at a meeting for worship, and to preach or exhort? Considered, that he has no such authority, and the members that move from one church into another, ought always to bring a certificate of their membership and standing.

1850 ART. 40. Whether an ordained brother, who had been once in avoidance, can be restored again to his full office? Considered, that a brother can be restored again to his full office by the voice of the church (as in a choice).

1851 ART. 6. A query concerning the ordaining of elders. Considered, that the ordination of elders is of the utmost importance to the church, and should always be under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, who will teach and remind a church of the right person and the proper time for ordination; that there should be a full union of the church, and the elders present, on the subject; and that where there is any serious objection, according to the word of God (See I. Tim. iii. 1-7; Titus I. 7), the elders and the church should be cautious to proceed, if the objection could not be removed.

1852 ART. 9. What is the duty of a bishop, who has the oversight of an adjoining congregation, in which there is no householder, and only one speaker, and has that church liberty to call elders, and have a bishop or speaker appointed? Considered, that it is the duty of a bishop to attend to the necessities of such church, and if he neglects his duty, such church, if unanimous, may call other elders to assist them.

1853 ART. 4. Is it consistent with the gospel and its principles, as professed by our brotherhood, when a brother is chosen to the ministry only, not being authorized to baptize, that the ordained elder of the congregation should forward such brother, without consulting the church? Considered, that all the power under God is vested in the church, and that, therefore, the church should, in all cases, be consulted.

1853 ART. 11. What is the most proper or scriptural mode of ordaining an elder or bishop—by the voice of the church, over whom the elder is to be ordained, or by the wish or declaration of the elders or bishops of neighboring churches? Answered by referring to the minutes of 1851, Art. 6.

1853 ART. 35. How is it considered when churches, having no overseer, call upon those old brethren, who have an oversight over them, to come and assist them in weighty matters, and they do not attend? Considered, that such elders ought to attend, and if they do not, the church may call on other elders to assist them. (See Minutes of 1852, Art. 9).

1854 ART. 13. In case a leading brother in the ministry (ordained or not ordained) would be reported as having committed a gross public fault, and the ordained brethren of an adjoining congregation, at the request of some of the members of the church where the fault has been committed, call a council in that church and investigate the matter; have these ordained brethren done right? Considered, that in such case, those ordained brethren would have done right, inasmuch as the individual church is, however large it may be, only a branch or member of the body of Christ, and inasmuch as it is the duty of ordained elders to take care of every branch of that body, especially when the leading member is sick or unfaithful.

1855 ART. 17. If two brethren were chosen, at one and the same time, as ministers in the first degree, and some time afterward advanced together to the second degree, and in course of time the church is in need of an overseer or bishop, can those two brethren both be ordained as such, or only one? Considered, that in such a case both brethren may be ordained, provided there be no sufficient cause known to prevent it.

1856 ART. 28. A request from the church in Fayette County, Pennsylvania, to have our dear brother, James Quinter, ordained for the office of an overseer at this Yearly Meeting. Concluded, that inasmuch as this brother had not been able to be present here, Brethren Joseph Showalter, of Stark, and Henry Kurtz, of Mahoning, Ohio, be appointed as a committee to attend to this business.

1859 ART. 15. How is it considered when a bishop moves from his district into a third district, and takes no letter of recommendation along with him, but wants to retain the oversight of the church he has left, and says he will still keep his standing in that church during his life, although he is frequently absent from their regular meetings? Answer: He should have a letter of recommendation from the church from which he moved, and if the distance is not too great, he may still retain the oversight of that church, while his doing so may produce no difficulties.

1862 ART. 23. Is it agreeable to the gospel and the rule of the brethren for a bishop to put the office of elder or second degree of the ministry upon a brother, when it appears the majority of the members present are opposed, and so are also two elders who are present? And when it is proposed to take the voice or vote of the church, that is also refused, but he puts the office upon him when he has got his hat on and when he is quarreling with another brother, and when nearly all the members have left, all but eight or ten? And is such a brother legally installed into office? Answer: We consider such a brother not legally installed. And we consider, according to the gospel, that the bishop who did so, should make satisfaction to the church.

1863 ART. 16. Has an ordained elder, according to the brethren's order, the right to come into an adjoining district, and bring a committee along with him, and there reconsider matters without the counsel of the church, over which, also, an ordained elder presides? Considered, that no ordained elder has a right to do so [in ordinary cases.]

1865 ART. 18. What is the decision of the council in the case of an elder who refuses to fill the duties of his office? Answer: We think such brethren should be admonished, and earnestly entreated to desist from such a course; and, if that will not control him, a committee should be appointed to inform him that if his course is persisted in he will fall into the judgment of the church.

1865 ART. 41. What is the order of the church in ordaining a minister by laying on of hands? Answer: It is as follows: 1. A request is deemed necessary to be made by the church, and approved by the elders present. 2. Then the elders take the sense of each member, one by one, to know whether they are satisfied with ordaining the brother eldest in office. And if they agree, and no serious objection is made, the ordination is proceeded with, which is done by laying on of hands, with prayer, and then the members receive the brother as at the first installation.

1865 ART. 50. If a bishop be accused with a fault in ruling or keeping house, and the church calls a committee of elders and delivers unto them the charges, and the committee, upon deliberation, suspends him, or relieves him of his office, without informing him (the accused) of the charges against him, and giving him no privilege of answering to the charges, and of defending himself, are the proceedings of the church and committee according to order and justice? Answer: No.

1866 ART. 4. If an elder rejects the decisions or counsel of a committee sent by the Annual Meeting, the majority of the church sustaining him, what course should be pursued to bring him to submit? Answer: We consider it wrong for an elder, with a part of the church, to reject the decision of a committeee sent by the Annual Meeting; but in such a case the minority should have the privilege to apply for the same, or another committee.

1866 ART. 35. Is a single brother eligible to the office of bishop or deacon? And does Paul mean when he says to Timothy, "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife," that he must be a married man, or does he mean that he should have but one wife at a time? I. Tim. iii. 12. Answer: We consider that a single brother can hold the office of a bishop or deacon, if duly qualified in other respects, and that married brethren can hold either office, being the husband of one wife at a time.

1872 ART. 3. Are members justifiable in refusing to commune with bishops of other churches who tolerate pride in their churches, when the Annual Meeting makes it their duty to enforce plainness? Answer: Not until it is understood that the elders who are said to have tolerated the evil alluded to have been admonished and labored with, to get them in order.

1872 ART. 6. What is the ancient and established order of the brethren, when elders are called to labor in another arm of the church? Are they to be taken in the private council with the laboring brethren of that church, or not? Answer: They may be taken into the private council.

1873 ART. 10. Is it according to the Scripture, and the order of the brotherhood, to have two or more housekeepers in the same church, at the same time? Answer: It is in accordance with the order of the brotherhood, and also in accordance with the spirit of the gospel. (See Titus i. 5; II. Tim. ii .2).

1873 ART. 19. What is to be done in case one of the members of the church pleads guilty in the act of fornication, is it the duty of the housekeeper of said church to take the voice of every member present, whether such an one is only to be excommunicated, or put in avoidance, or is it the duty for such housekeeper to put such a member into avoidance at once, according to I. Cor. v? Answer: We consider that an elder has no right to either expel a member from the church, or to put him in avoidance, without the counsel of the church.

1875 ART. 18. Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting has decided that it is inconsistent for brethren that will not conform to the order of the church to preach, are not the elders neglecting a duty in suffering such to go on, and through their influence whole churches become out of order? And while the Annual Council has also decided that it is the duty of the adjoining elders to set such ministers and churches in order, will not this district-meeting and the Annual Meeting urge the brethren to see that the general order of the brethren is more fully carried out? Answer: The southern district of Ohio urges the elders to do so, and this Annual Meeting does the same.

1876 ART. 12. Is it right for an elder, or for elders, to take up charges and act upon them without name or authorship? Answer: An elder may receive a complaint from a report injurious to the Christian character of a brother, without the name of the person who makes the complaint, but a direct charge against a member should be accompanied by the name of the brother who makes the charge.

1877 ART. 21. Will not this district meeting re-petition the Annual Meeting to reconsider query 8, of 1874, and repeal that portion of answer of said query where it says, "You have no authority to go into the acknowledged territory of any organized church to make appointments for preaching unless called for by the elders or council of said church; it is an assumption of authority for an ordained elder to do so?" We,, the District of West Virginia, grant the above request. Answer: Inasmuch as ministering brethren have abused their liberty in being too ready to go into other congregations, and there preaching and talking in a way that has given trouble and produced confusion in the congregations into which they have gone, we think it best not to make the change asked for. Prudent ministers will have no difficulty from the restrictions.

1878 ART. 18. Is it according to the gospel and the order of the Brethren, for one ordained elder to ordain and install a brother who is in the second degree of the ministry to the full office of eldership, where the distance is so great that it is a hard matter to have two ordained elders present on such an occasion? Answer: It is not according to the gospel and the order of the church to do so. (See Acts vi. 6; xii. 2; I Tim. iv. 14.)

1881 ART. 12. As Paul, in giving the qualifications of a bishop, does not say that he should be the oldest in office, we petition Annual Meeting to repeal that qualification, and confine the qualifications to scripture only. Answer: The brethren ordaining elders do not overlook the qualifications of elders as given by Paul, but the order of the church has been that when ministers eligible to office, and having about equal qualifications, to ordain the oldest. Provision, however, has been made that, under certain circumstances, the voice of the church may be taken to decide which of the ministers shall be ordained.

1881 ART. 31. Is it right, or according to the gospel and the order of the Berthren, for an elder to get up in annual council, and express himself that there is a number of decisions passed at annuel council that he does not regard at all, and then have such a one on the Standing Committee? Answer: It is not right to do so.

1897 ART. 2. We, the brethren and sisters, desire that the Yearly Meeting of 1897 would advise on the matter of elders moving from one church district to another. It seems that in some places they are received with hand and kiss, as at first; and in other places by just reading their letters of recommendation which they bring. We think it would be better to have but one way, so that we might be more uniform in our practice, and be as the apostle says: "That ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you." I Cor .i. 10. Answer: This Yearly Meeting advises that elders and all members be received by a good letter of recommendation, proprly signd by the church from which they moved, without again being received by hand and kiss or further church counsel.

1900 ART. 2. When a charge or complaint is brought against an elder or minister, so that it is considered necessary for a visit to be sent, whose duty is it to perform the visit? Answer: We advise that two elders investigate any charge or complaint against any elder or minister.

1900 ART. 4. If a sister has been an elder's wife and has been received to the full office, and she then being left a widow and afterwards marries a brother only a lay member, can she still hold her office, or shall she be put back with her present husband? As there has been a difference of opinion among some of the members, can this Annual Meeting give a Scriptural answer? Answer: Let her hold her office, as with her former husband, as we know of no Scripture justifying the church in depriving a sister of an office without charge of crime laid against her. I Cor. 7. 39.

1901 ART. 5. Two queries were presented asking for the reconsideration of query 2 of the minutes of 1900, which reads as fololws: "When a charge or complaint is brought against an elder or minister, so that it is considered necessary for a visit to be sent, whose duty is it to perform the visit?" Answer: Reconsidered and amended by Annual Meeting of 1901. We advise that two elders investigate any charge or complaint against any elder or minister, where it reasonably can be done.

1927 ART. 3. Inasmuch as experience has found it not to be the best to overburden elders with the oversight of numerous churches, therefore we pray this A. M. to say that no elders shall have the oversight of more than two churches at a time when it can be reasonably avoided. Answer: We grant the request. Passed.

1927 ART. 4. We ask this A. M. to outline the legal method of procedure in bringing and presenting charges against an elder or body of elders, so we all may work by the same rule, and avoid the hindering of church work by irregular or rash charging of elders. Answer: We adopt Art. 27, Minutes of 1880, with the amendment that such accusers should be dealt with as transgressors. Passed.

1927 ART. 5. Is it legal to ordain an elder without the consent of the adjoining elders? Does Art. 41, 1865 grant such proceedings If so, are all later decisions on the subject null and void? See minutes of 1881, Art. 18 and appendix papers, or questions 2 and 3 page 33. Answer: It is not legal to ordain an elder without the consent of the adjoining elders, and we do not think that Art. 41, 1865 sanctions such proceedings, and that Art. 18, 1881 should be respected in the future. Passed.

1934 ART. 1. In regard to adjoining elders we ask the following questions: 1st. Is an elder, having the charge of a church, but not having his home in said church, an adjoining elder to the adjoining churches of said church? 2nd. Are two churches having another church lying between them, adjoining churches? 3rd. If a church has but few adjoining elders, and some of them for various causes, might be disqualified or unable at the time needed to labor in said church, would it be allowable under such conditions for that church to go beyond what are strictly adjoining elders in calling help, yet she in making such calls, respects her adjoining elders so far as conditions would reasonably admit?

Anwer: To part 1st, Yes. To part 2nd, No. To part 3rd, Yes. It would be allowable with due respect to disqualified elders.

Bishops; Authority of

1846 ART. 4. Is there, in the churches of the brethren, any material difference among the bishops, so that one has more power than another? Considered, that according to the word of our Savior (Matt. xxiii. 8), "One is your master ,even Christ: and all ye are brethren," there is no difference in the brotherhood or among bishops but that which a higher age and more wisdom and experience may give. See I. Pet. v. 5: "Ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder."

1848 ART. 20. Whether three or more ordained elders have the authority of liberating, out of avoidance, independent of the church? Considered, that it can not be done properly without the counsel and consent of the church.

1849 ART. 37. If a member commits an open fault in the world, has the overseer authority to send brethren to investigate the matter before counseling the church? Considered, that the overseer has the authority to do so.

1850 ART. 17. How is it considered, when a sister has an unbelieving husband, who gets drunk and abuses her, and tempts to kill her with an ax; she then leaves him and returns to her father, who then goes to the housekeeper in the church for advice, upon whose advice a bill of divorce is obtained? Considered, that a housekeeper has no right to give such advice, without counseling the church, neither has the sister a right to get divorced without such counsel. (See Matt. xix. 6-9; I Cor. vii. 11.)

1869 ART. 18. How is it considered if the majority of a congregation decide against the decisions of the Annual Council, can the bishop of said congregation act with the minority of said church, and the decision of the Annual Meeting? Answer: He can, as the Annual Meeting is of higher authority than any one church.

1876 ART. 22. What does the Annual Meeting consider should be done with elders and others, who make promise to a committee sent by the Annual Meeting to set things in order among them, and then do not respect the reports made to them by the committee, and do not comply with their promises for eighteen months or two years? Answer: This Annual Meeting authorizes the committee appointed to California in 1874, to see that their report is properly carried out.

Bonds and Notes—Buying and Selling

1810 ART. 1. About brethren who intend selling bonds, it was considered, that it should not be done without the counsel of the church.

1817 ART. 6. Whether we may sell a note (or bond) or not? Considered, that no member should sell a note without the consent of the debtor.

1821 ART. 7. With regard to selling bonds, it was considered, that none should be sold by which poor people might be oppressed; but since circumstances are so different, the church should be counseled (asked for counsel in any case).

1858 ART. 21. Is it right, according to the gospel, for brethren to purchase notes from brethren, or others, and shave them at 15 per cent. or more? Considered, that it is not according to the gospel for brethren to do so.

1864 ART. 16. Is it right, and according to the gospel, for a brother to invest money in government bonds? Answer: We consider it not wrong to do so.

1865 ART. 13. Is it right, according to the gospel and our profession, for brethren to buy county bonds, bearing six per cent interest, and shave them twelve and a half per cent? Answer: We think it most consistent with our profession not to deal in such stock.

1884 SEC. 28. (Recon. Min.) INVESTING IN GOVERNMENT BONDS. See Article 16, 1864, and Article 39, 1865. In the above it is allowed, but we recommend to advise that members would do well not to invest. (Accepted).

1924 ART. 2. We ask for the reconsideration of Art. 2 of the minutes of 1922 and also of the revised minutes, Section 28, and say we cannot allow our brethren to invest their money in non-taxable bonds in such a way that their brethren will have to pay their taxes, and say we cannot allow it according to the Scriptures, as follows: Matt. 7:12; 17:24, 25, 26, 27. Luke 6:31; 12:15, 20, 34, 25. Rom. 13:6, 7. Eph. 5:8. Answer: Considered that it is not according to the Gospel to invest money to avoid taxation. Matt. 17:27. Luke 20:25. Passed.

Banks; Borrowing From

1847 ART. 8. Whether it may be proper, and agreeable with the gospel, for a brother to borrow money from banks, or speculating money-lenders, for the purpose of buying and droving cattle, sheep, and horses, or for buying wheat, or other produce, and transporting the same to Atlantic cities, or other public markets, for the purpose of making gain or profit. Considered, that we, in general council, would advise any brother not to engage so largely in trading, as there is great danger in so doing, both in a temporal and a spiritual point of view. (See I. Tim. vi. 9, 10).

Breaking of Bread—See Communion

Brethren in Germany

1856 ART. 29. In relation to the brethren in Germany, it appears from all the documents and information presented to us, that they differ from us on baptism, feet-washing, and other points of faith and practice; hence, until we have a better evidence of their agreement with us in sentiment, and of their willingness to receive the doctrine of Christ as we have received it, we can not acknowledge them yet as brethren of the same faith with us, and inasmuch as they expressly refuse to accept of our charity, it should be reserved for future use. The letter of these brethren to be published in the "Gospel Visitor."

Butchering

1850 ART. 7. Is a brother, being a full member in the church, allowed to purchase cattle, and other animals, and follow butchering hire, or rent, a stall in a market-house, and attend market, as a butcher, every market morning? Considered, that a brother engaged in butchering, in the manner stated in the question, is surrounded with many difficulties and temptations, and that we would advise brethren not to do so.

Buying Land Sold For Taxes

1862 ART. 25. Is it right, according to the gospel, for a brother to buy land that is sold by the county for taxes? Answer: We consider that it is wrong for brethren to do so, when done for speculation.

Burial Cases and Caskets

1917 ART. 2. Inasmuch as Yearly Meeting of 1876, article 13, has decided that members should not get those fine, costly, and fashionable burial cases to bury their dead in; and as it seems as though of late it is becoming a prevailing custom by some of the members of our beloved fraternity to get those fashionable caskets to bury their dead in, will not this Yearly meeting urge and admonish our dear members to be more considerate and manifest more humility to the world at our funerals? Answer: We, your sub-committee, most earnestly and seriously ratify the prayer of this query, and also to have other things to correspond in plainness. Passed.

Camp Meetings

1848 ART. 11. Can it be considered prudent, or profitable, for members to frequent camp-meetings, or protracted meetings, from time to time? Unanimously considered, not to be profitable for members so to do.

Carpets

1827 ART. 8. How is it considered to lay carpets in (our) houses? It was considered that it belongs to the grandeur (highness) of this world, and that it will not become a follower of Jesus to garnish his house in this manner, but rather that he should adorn his house as may be consistent with lowliness.
1827, and Art. 11, of the Annual Meeting of 1828, and give houses, was considered, that it can not and should not be, because it leads to elevation (pride).

1878 ART. 10. Will this district meeting petition the Annual Meeting of 1878 to reconsider Art. 8, of Annual Meeting of 1827, and Art 11, of the Annual Meeting of 1828, and give us a more definite answer, or show, by the gospel, that if we have common plain carpets on our floors it will lead to elevation (pride)? Answer: We consider the above queries, and decide that plain carpets have no tendency to pride and elvation, and that they may be enjoyed by us; but fine and fancy carpets are not consistent with our humble profession, and should not be in our houses.
1883 SEC. 19. (Recon. Min.) CARPETS in our houses. The minutes of 1878, Art. 10, we adopt. Ask it to be reprinted on these minutes.

Carriages

1828 ART. 2. Whether we may conform ourselves to the world with unnecessary things on our carriages? Considered, that it can not be.

1882 ART. 11. We ask this respectable body of members to unite and dispense with the "Russia top" buggies, and use plain carriages so as to correspond with our profession. Answer: We advise that we buy and use plain vehicles that we appear not in the style of the world, and thus honor our profession.

Certificates of Membership

1788 ART. **2.** The next was almost equally important, inasmuch it has happened that members have moved from one section of the country to another, and improprieties had been committed by them in the place from whence they moved, which are such as reflect no honor on the doctrine of the Lord, nor either on (our) Christian profession, so that we had to withdraw from them the kiss of charity, and they concealed this at the place where they had moved to, and sometimes it was discovered afterward, so that offense of tender minds might result therefrom; we conclude, likewise, and find it more proper and perfect, that such removing family or member should bring a certificate from the church where they leave, to the church to which they move.
1841 ART. 12. What is to be done with a brother or member who removes into another church without bringing a certificate of membership along, and who being asked for it is offended by the request? Considered, that as it has been decided often heretofore, it is requisite for members that remove from

one church into another to bring a testimony or certificate along of their standing in the church from whence they came, and that they ought not to be offended at being asked for the same. Should they refuse still to procure a certificate, the church to which they came would have a right to ascertain their standing before receiving them to full membership.

1848 ART. 6. (Special Council). What is the sense of the brethren, when two districts are in one neighborhood, and members from other parts move into one district, and wish to hand in their certificate, and to attach themselves to the other district? Considered, that it would be best, always, that when districts are laid off, all those in the one district ought to belong to it, and those in the other to that.

1848 ART. 8. (Special Council). How it is considered, if a brother, that is chosen for an office in the church, should move from one church and neighborhood to another, and bring no testimony along—whether he can be received in his office before a testimony arrives? Considered, that, if such a brother moves only a little way, into a church where his standing is generally known, there would be no need of a written testimony; but if a brother should move a considerable distance, it is right and proper to require a testimony before such is received in his office.

1848 ART. 26. Whether it is proper in all cases to ask counsel before giving a letter of recommendation? Considered, to be best always first to take the counsel of the church.

1849 ART. 12. Concerning the propriety and necessity of recommendations for members that move from one church to another? Considered, that the ministers in the various churches should see that none of their members should move away without a recommendation, that no church is bound to receive a member without recommendation, and that the recommendation be signed by not less than two or three witnesses, according to the gospel; that the apostles gave written recommendations. (See Rom. xvi. 1, 2; I. Cor. xvi. 10, 11; II. Cor. viii. 23; Eph. vi. 21, 22; Col. iv. 7-9; I. Thess, iii. 2, etc).

1849 ART. 13. When a member offends in a church, and moves away without being reconciled, can he obtain a certificate by writing, without personally presenting himself? Considered, when a member removes, under such circumstances, and is so far away, or situated unfavorably for coming back to make reconciliation, when he wishes to do so, if the church from which he removed is satisfied with his acknowledgments, made in writing, it may signify this satisfaction in a letter to the church where he resides.

1853 ART. 24. Is it right to give a certificate to a brother, when he moves out of the church district without paying his debts, or giving general satisfaction to his creditors? Considered, that if the church is satisfied of the brother's having been honest, and having done all that he could to pay his debts and satisfy his creditors, he ought to have a certificate. But should the brother be able, and not willing to pay his debts, or give or try to give, satisfaction to his creditors, he should by no means have a certificate of full membership in the church.

1856 ART. 15. Can a brother, or one that calls himself one, be a witness in church matters, without bringing a certificate of membership from the church whence he came? Considered, that members should always have letters of membership, or be known as full members.

1862 ART. 20. What shall be done in such a case as follows: There is a brother and sister living here who claim to have stood in full fellowship with a church called Dunkards, in Lycoming County, Pennsylvania? When asked for a certificate, the brother said the church from which they moved did not give certificates, allowing that their conduct should suffice, and this has been quite satisfactory to the members of this church. Answer: We consider it right in all cases when members move from one arm of the church to another, that they shall present to the church wherein they wish to reside, a certificate, to prove their membership in the church from whence they came, or give satisfaction to the church of which they wish to become members.

1864 ART. 4. Inasmuch as there are many members of our churches traveling from one state to another, and staying from home four to eight months, would it not be better for members, under such circumstances, to obtain a certificate of membership from the church in which they live? Answer: We think it would be better to do so.

1864 ART. 34. How is it considered by the Annual Meeting, if a brother or sister present a certificate of membership where they wish to reside, and after a while demand it again, and receive it; do they thereby withdraw their membership from said district of the church? Answer: We think they can not withdraw their membership legally by so doing, and that certificates should not be given up under such circumstances.

1865 ART. 30. If a brother remove from one arm of the church to another, and can not obtain a certificate of membership from the former church, can the church into which he moved, understanding the difficulty with the former church, be the judge in the matter? Answer: We think not. The church from which the member moved should give the certificate.

1866 ART. 5. If a member receives a certificate of membership, is he still considered a member of that arm of the church in which he received the certificate, until he presents it to another arm? And, if so, how long can a member hold a certificate, without presenting it, before he loses his membership entirely? Answer: We think he is, until he had sufficient time to hand in his letter, and has willingly neglected to do so. (See Paul to Philemon).

1869 ART. 15. Would it not be more in accordance with the gospel, and the order of the brethren, to have a more uniform practice in giving letters of recommendation to members moving from one arm of the church to another? Answer: We think it best to let the churches write certificates as will suit them, as this has heretofore been the practice of the brethrn.

1870 ART. 10. Is it according to the Scriptures, and the order of the brethren, for a brother who moves from one district of the church to another, and obtains his letter, to carry it for months and still refuse to give it up? And what is to be done in such a case, and which church is to consider it? Answer: We consider the answer to Art. 5, in the minutes of 1866, a sufficient answer to the above query.

1871 ART. 29. Will not the Annual Meeting make it binding on all the churches to furnish all members, moving from one place to another, with letters of recommendation, or a reason why not when asked? Answer: The churches shall give recommendations, or a lawful reason why not.

1871 ART. 32. In order to avoid imposition on the churches, should not all the members of the church, and especially traveling preachers, be furnished with a certificate, properly signed, showing their standing in the church? Answer: We consider it advisable that members of the church, under the circumstances alluded to, should be supplied with certificates.

1871 ART. 36. Would it not be more consistent with the gospel for the brethren to adopt a definite name in writing letters of recommendation? Answer: We think it would be good to head all letters of recommendation as follows: "We, the German Baptist Brethren, send greeting."

1877 ART. 2. How does this Annual Meeting understand the fifth article of the minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1866, when members have located in a church and have willingly neglected and refused to present their letters as specified in said article? Has said church the authority to disown said members the same as transgressing members of that arm of the church, or has said church the authority only to withhold from such members all church fellowship? Answer: The said church has not complete jurisdiction over such members, but may withhold the ordinances from them and refer their case to the church they moved from, if they refuse to hand in their letter.

1881 ART. 1. Inasmuch as Annual Meeting has again and again decided in favor of plainness and uniformity in dress for both brethren and sisters, and recommending to the churches to enforce it, especially upon the ministers, and after all the counsel of Annual Meeting there is a great lack of uniformity in dress on the part of some members, ministers, and deacons who travel and move from place to place, and do not regard the plain uniformity as recommended by Annual Meeting. The question is, Is it right, according to the gospel and the order of the church, especially official members, to get a certificate of membership, who move from one arm of the church to another, and who do not observe the authorized decisions of Annual Meeting? Answer: This Annual Meeting decides that we cannot grant a good certificate to such members, especially the officials.

1883 SEC. 20. (Recon. Min.) CERTIFICATES of membership. The former decision upon this subject we retain, and from this forward we advise to supply the word "old" in connection with the title "German Baptist." This feature not to be omitted in certificates.

1893 ART. 4. Inasmuch as trouble has grown out of the manner of writing out certificates of membership, when only partially filled, would it not be better to write all such letters in full, or give none at all, so that we have order here as well as elsewhere? Answer: We advise, when a full certificate can not be given, to give none at all until the church considers the member worthy of a full letter.

1904 ART. 1. How is it considered if a deacon brother dies, and then his wife moves to another arm of the church, is it necessary for her to have a letter as a deacon's wife, or only a common letter of membership? If it is necessary, why not have it on the minutes: A letter of membership should specify the member's standing.

1904 ART. 5. How is it considered by the Yearly Meeting when members have moved from one church to another and can not get their church letter on account of disobedience, and in the meantime the church into which they have moved has a communion; has the latter church a right to allow those disobedient members to commune before they have obtained their church letter, knowing the former church has complaints against them? Answer: We, the standing committee, advise that such members be advised not to commune anywhere until satisfaction is rendered. Passed by the general council.

1906 ART. 1. Does this Yearly Meeting consider a congregation bound to receive a member or members by letter who are out of order? Answer: This Yearly Meeting decides that congregations of the church are not bound to receive a member or members into fellowship by letter who refuse to conform to the established order of the brotherhood; and we further advise that all housekeepers of congregations be more careful to have their members in order before necessity demands a certificate of membership.

Choice and Installation of Ministers, Etc.

1835 ART. 5. How it is viewed to elect brethren for the ministry by lot? Considered, to abide the manner of holding a choice hitherto observed.

1837 ART. 4. How it is considered, to administer the anointing of the sick, or to hold an election, without an ordained brother (elder) being present? It is the advice, that the anointing of the sick should not be administered without an ordained brother, except in a case of necessity, that no such is to be had; for the word says: Call for the elders of the church. As to holding elections, it is considered that no election ought to be held without the presence of (two or) at least one ordained brother.

1838 ART. 9. Whether we have the right to appoint deacons without laying hands on them, according to the example of the apostles? Acts vi. 6. Considered and resolved, to postpone the further consideration of this query to the next Annual Meeting.

1838 ART. 12. Whether in case that brethren who are called to some ministry move from one church into another, are received with their office by the church to which they have removed, whether the sisters, their wives, ought to be received with them, as in the case of an election? Considered, that it would be good to receive the sisters also with them.

1839 ART. 6. With regard to the laying on of hands on deacons, it was concluded to leave it as heretofore. (See also yearly meetings, 1844, 1; 1845, 11; 1846, 3.)

1840 ART. 1. Whether it be agreeable to the gospel, as the brethren do, hold elections for teachers and deacons? Considered, that our mode to hold elections is according to the gospel, and that we do not know how to improve it.

1843 ART. 7. When a large church, by common consent, has been divided into several districts, and in one of these districts it is found necessary to hold an election for teachers and deacons, whether the members of such district alone are entitled to vote, or whether the members of the other districts have a right to vote also? Considered, that when such a division takes place by common consent, for the greater convenience of members and of meetings, we understand it that henceforth these several districts are to form so many particular churches, though they may be under the superintendence of but one bishop, and that consequently when one of these districts, or one of these particular churches stands in need of laborers, and has to hold an election, it would be as improper for the members of the other districts to vote at such election as it would be for members from other churches that never formed a part of the old and large district. In case there were no express word for such things, we think we may safely follow the Apostle Paul, when he says (I. Cor. xi. 14), "Doth not nature itself teach you" what is proper?

1843 ART. 8. How it might be considered when, at an election for teachers and deacons, absent members do send their votes with other members? Considered, that since the promise of our Savior is given, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them (Matt. xviii. 20), in such important church affairs this promise belongs only to those that are assembled, and not to those that are absent; the brethren generally have acted upon that ground, and not taken any vote from absent members.

1848 ART. 4. How to forward a brother to the ministry, as speaker, according to the gospel? Considered, that the church is exhorted to prayer, to guide them in a proper choice, not discussing the subject with each other, but keeping their thoughts before God only; two ordained elders to be invited by the church to hold an election, who shall preside, and declare the one having the highest number of votes as chosen; the brother so chosen, having declared his willingness to fulfill the duties laid on him, is then received by hand and kiss.

1848 ART. 16. About the laying on of hands on deacons, it was unanimously considered, to postpone the discussion of this subject indefinitely, until there is reason to hope that it may be done clamly and without prejudice.

1853 ART. 41. Whether, in holding a choice for a teacher, after taking the voice of the church, there ought not to be lots cast between the two highest? Considered, that the practice of the church, generally, is to receive him who has the highest number of voices.

1858 ART. 42. How is it considered, if a member moves off some distance, and be absent awhile, and then return on a visit, and then, while at the place at which he formerly resided, conducting himself either becoming or unbecoming a follower of Christ, the church gives him permission to exhort or preach, by taking silence for consent? Considered, not according to the order of the brethren to do so.

1862 ART. 4. In installing official members into office in the church, is there to be any difference observed between near relations? Answer: There is no difference to be observed.

1862 ART. 50. Is it advisable to hold an election for a minister or deacon in one part of a congregation (in that in which it is most needed), and none but the members in that part voting, it being too small to form a separate church, providing the whole church consents to hold such an election? Answer: We consider it advisable to do so.

1853 ART. 4. Is it consistent with the gospel and its principles, as professed by our brotherhood, when a brother is chosen to the ministry only, not being authorized to baptize, that the ordained elder of the congregation should forward such brother, without consulting the church? Considered, that all the power under God is vested in the church, and that, therefore, the church should, in all such cases, be consulted.

1853 ART. 44. How it is considered when choices are held for teachers or deacons, in a different manner from the general usage, choosing by ballot, in presence of all the church, and without ordained elders from other churches being present? Considered, that a choice should be held by each and every member coming before the elders, and giving their voice privately. The presence of two, or at least one ordained elder, from another church, has been deemed necessary always, so as to avoid the least appearance of partiality, etc.

1856 ART. 5. Would it not be best in holding elections for the purpose of choosing ministers or deacons, that none of the ministering brethren of such district should take any part, or even be in the room where the votes of the members are received, but that brethren of other districts should be called for said purpose? Considered, that every member should have an equal privilege of giving their voices, and that the remainder of this query were best left to the control of the strange brethren.

1862 ART. 33. Would it not be advisable, when an election is to be held for both a speaker and a deacon, at the same time, to hold the election for the speaker first, and make the result known, and then hold the election for the deacon or deacons, as the case may be? Answer: We consider it would be advisable to do so.

1864 ART. 29. A brother being legally elected to the ministry a year ago, and refuses to be installed, and seldom attends church; what shall be done in such a case? Answer: The brother should be admonished, and encouraged to attend meetings and accept of his office, and the brethren should try and bear with him as long as the wants of the church will permit; but if he will not serve, and the church needs laborers, then it should elect others.

1865 ART. 17. What is the decision of this meeting in case brethren (especially official brethren) exercise a private influence in the election of members to office in the church? If wrong, what is the extent of the offense, and how can it be remedied? Answer: We think such brethren should be admonished, and earnestly entreated to desist from such a course; and, if that will not control him, a committee should be appointed to inform him that if his course is persisted in he will fall into the judgment of the church. The committee should be called from another church.

1865 ART. 44. When a church makes a choice for an officer, or for officers, and the bishop and ministers in the church in which the election is to be held, vote, when is the proper time for them to vote, at the beginning or at the close of the election? Answr: We think they should, by all means vote at the beginning, if they vote at all, and that they should be careful to observe the well-established rules of the brethren relative to such occasions, especially in calling elders from adjoining churches to be present at such times.

1865 ART. 48. Is it considered according to the gospel, and according to the order of the brethren, for absent members to send their votes to an election in the church by the hands of other members? Answer: It is not.

1867 ART. 10. Can we not get a more scriptural plan to elect church officers? Answer: We consider it best to defer this query for further consideration.

1867 ART. 28. Would it not be more consistent with all other rules and orders of the brethren to elect elders by votes, in all cases? Answer: We consider it best to make no change in the general manner of appointing elders, but we think cases may occur when the church, acting in concert with the elders who visit a church to ordain an elder, may take the voice of the church in which the ordination is to take place, to know which of the ministering brethren in the church she desires to be ordained.

1868 ART. 7. In choosing a brother to the ministry, would it not be nearer to the spirit of the gospel to cast lots for one among those having received votes, than the way we have been proceeding heretofore? Answer: We judge it best to make no change at present in electing our church officers.

1868 ART. 9. When ministers of other denominations join the brethren, can they be received as ministers in any other way but in the regular order of the church? Answer: We deem it not prudent to receive them in any other way.

1871 ART. 1. What is to be done when a church needs a brother in the second degree of ministry, but lacks confidence to advance the one that is oldest in office; yet, out of necessity, the church has tried twice to advance him, but was opposed each time by the majority of the members voting against him? Answer: The brother should be informed of the cause of such opposition, so that he may have an opportunity to remove it; and if he can remove the cause, then the church may, and should advance him; but if the cause is not removed, then the church may advance the next one in office.

1871 ART. 6. Whereas, the eastern district of Maryland has decided that our colored brother, Elias Fisher, be authorized to preach the gospel to the colored people, and since he was installed there have been exceptions taken to the manner of his promotion, will this Annual Meeting confirm the decision of the eastern district of Maryland? Answer: In relation to the above case, it appears, from what this Annual Meeting has learned, that there has been a failure on the part of the elders in the district to authorize Bro. Fisher to preach, and owing to said failure, a brother in the second degree installed him, by the laying on of hands. As this was a departure from the practice of the church, we think it was very improper; and, while we recognize Bro. Fisher as a minister among us, we consider him only in the first degree, regarding the laying on of hands as conferring no official authority whatsoever.

1873 ART. 18. Is it right to put a brother into the office to serve as deacon or minister who does not conform to the order of the church, or allow them to serve in any church business at district or Yearly Meetings? And would it not be best for brethren that officiate where an election is going on to instruct the church not to give their voice to any that do not conform to the order of the church? Answer: We advise brethren to be very careful in giving the brethren power or office who will not conform to the order.

1876 ART. 15. Is it according to the gospel, and order of the brethren, when a brother is elected to the ministry, and accepts the office, and is installed, and afterward gets disobedient, and says he can not preach, for the church to release him so far as he is not under any obligations to preach only in case he should feel to do so, and thereby help him to live in disobedience, and give him liberty to serve as a deacon, when he was never elected to a deacon's office? If so, let the gospel authority be presented. Answer: We consider it neither according to the gospel nor the order of the brethren to do so.

1880 ART. 20. When a district or church, with a satisfactory majority, decides to hold an election, and all the members present come before the elders receiving the votes, and a majority say they have no choice, shall that majority render the election null and void, or shall the brother having the majority of votes cast be declared elected? Answer: When the majority of the members of a church would come before the elders and say, "We have no choice," it would be best to pronounce no one elected.

1881 ART. 11. WHEREAS, The officers in the church are the servants of the church, and it is therefore reasonable that they should be the servants of the majority, and as it is possible for a person to be elected against his will to fill an office by a minority (with the plurality system) only to be publicly disgraced by being deposed by a majority who had never chosen **him,**

Resolved, That we petition Annual Meeting to authorize all elections in the brotherhood to be made by a majority of the votes cast.

Answer: We decide that no change shall be made at present in the manner of electing our church officers.

1900 ART. 7. We fail to find in the minutes the manner of proceeding in a congregation in the election of a brother to the ministry. We therefore petition this Yearly Meeting to place on our minutes a form setting forth plainly the mode of procedure in calling for and holding an election for a speaker. Answer: We look upon this work with much caution and importance, from beginning to end. When it becomes sufficiently apparent and needful, in a local congregation, to call a brother to the ministry, it becomes the duty of the elder or elders in charge to consult their co-laborers in the ministry; and if they see the propriety of a move in the direction of an election, then it becomes the duty of those in charge to consult the visiting berthren, and if the official body agree in union, or submit, then the laity is consulted, and if all seem to be united in the propriety of the work under consideration, the election can be entered into, after due time and consideration, by a private voice of all the members present in the charge for that purpose, by elders and ministers being present; the Scriptures first to be read and explained, touching the qualifications set forth by Paul to 1 Timothy, third chapter. Further duties are set forth in the minutes, Art. 8, 1874. See also Recon. Min., Sec. 37.

Church

1848 ART. 8. Whether the brethren, in annual meeting, could not adopt a plan, that small churches, which seem to be on a decline, could be better attended to? Considered, that such churches should call on the neighboring churches, and these should attend to them; moreover, it is the advice of this Yearly Meeting, that every ordained brother ought faithfully to perform his duty in this respect.

1853 ART. 26. How one arm of the church shall proceed toward another, in case of a departure from the general order of the church? Considered, that inasmuch as all the arms of the church are but one body in Christ, and each arm stands in the same relation to the other as an individual member stands to the other individual member; and inasmuch as an individual is not only at liberty, but commanded to go to his brother, if that brother has done something by which he considers himself grieved, in order to gain his brother to an arm of the church, feeling aggrieved at proceedings in and by another arm, has not only a right, but also a solemn duty to do likewise, and to do it either by going or writing to such arm.

1857 ART. 32. If a brother removes from one church to another, and is received by the church to which he removes as a full member, by certificate or otherwise, and afterward a difficulty arises with him in the church in which he formerly resided, is his case to be tried in the church into which he removed, or is he to have his trial in the church in which the difficulty originated? Answer: It is judged proper that his case be referred back to the church from which he removed.

1872 ART. 1. Has the church a right to pass resolutions and decisions, and enforce them to the expulsion of members from the body, without thus saith the positive law of the Lord? Answer: The church shall not expel any member without gospel authority.

1872 ART. 5. Is the gospel a perfect law to govern the church in all things necessary to salvation? Answer: It is.

1876 ART. 26. To the Annual Meeting of the German Baptist brethren, for the year of our Lord, 1876, we send greeting: Inasmuch as a committee sent to the Brush Creek Church, Adams County, Ohio, by the Annual Meeting of 1874, found that we of the above-named church asked the questions of applicants for baptism before going into the water; that we had in part adopted the single mode of feet-washing, and that we dismiss our congregations with a benediction, said committee required of us that we abandon the last, practice the double mode of feet-washing, and to send the first to the Annual Meeting. The Brush Creek Church, in consultation upon these subjects, has unanimously decided to practice the single mode of feet-washing, to continue the use of the benediction, and to ask questions to applicants before going into the water, as it formerly has done. And we request this district meeting of southern Ohio to send to the Annual Meeting these three questions, to-wit: 1. Is it wrong to dismiss a congregation with a benediction? 2. Are we wrong in washing feet by the single mode? 3. Is it wrong to ask questions to applicants for baptism before going into the water? And inasmuch as the Brush Creek Church, in southern Ohio, is dissatisfied with their district-meeting of 1874, because it called to the Annual Meeting of that year for a committee to visit our church upon mere report; is dissatisfied with the Annual Meeting of 1874, because it appointed said committee on said report, and contrary to its own law, is also dissatisfied with that committee for coming here, without any notice to us of what they were coming for; we therefore ask a satisfactory explanation of the whole proceeding, or an acknowledgment to us by each of those bodies for their conduct in these matters.

Query 1st: Can the Annual Meeting claim its decisions as advice only (See Minutes of 1866, Art. 34), and at the same time threaten with expulsion those who do not obey them?

Query 2d: Is a committee justifiable in threatening a church with expulsion, after admitting that said church has all the essentials of salvation?

We also ask of the district-meeting of southern Ohio, to recognize Wm. Calvert and Landon West as delegates from the Brush Creek Church to the district and Annual Meetings of our brethren for the year 1876.

May Hill, Adams Co., Ohio, April 15, 1876.

Whereas, a committee was sent by the Annual Meeting of 1874, to the Brush Creek Church, in Adams County, Ohio, to set things in order in said church; and, whereas, the report of said committee was accepted by said church, but it has not only failed but refused to carry out said report; therefore, resolved, that we can not consistently do otherwise than hold said church to the carrying out of the report of the committee, as it promised to do, and also require of it to take back certain offensive charges contained in an address to the district of southern Ohio, and through it to the Annual Meeting, dated April 15, 1876.

The following committee, being the committee sent in 1874, is re-appointed to go to said church to do whatever is necessary to be done in the case; H. D. Davy, R. H. Miller, and John Wise. J. Quinter was added to the committee.

Church

1877 ART. 13. Will not the Annual Meeting give some plan for the adjoining elders to be assembled when it is necessary to set churches in order? Answer: Where churches are out of order, the elders themselves not carrying out the order, it is the duty of the adjoining elders to notify the resident elder to call his church together at a set time, the elders and church involved having the privilege to call any disinterested elders, if they are such as are in the order of the general brotherhood, from any church.

1877 ART. 33. This Annual Meeting decides that the Southern District of Ohio shall take into their care and oversight the churches of Highland and Adams counties, Ohio, to which the Annual Meeting sent committees in 1874 and 1876, and said churches having accepted the report of said committees of said district, shall assist the brethren appointed at district meeting to have the said decisions carried out in a spirit of love and forbearance, and work with them to have them come to the order recognized by our brotherhood.

1880 ART. 9. What should be done with a brother who for years neglects to attend church, and after being visited repeatedly by the church and admonished to faithfulness, still refuses to assign any reason for his non-attendance, and will not agree to TRY to attend church? Answer: They should be abmonished again and again, and if they still persist in neglecting to attend church without a legal excuse, then the church should deal with them as disobedient members.

Churches—Isolated

1893 ART. 1. The Beaver Creek Church of Wisconsin, petitions the Annual Meeting of 1893 to provide some plan by which the isolated churches could be visited more frequently and have more preaching. Answer: This meeting recommends the following: If calls are made to any local church, and said church is not able to meet the call or calls, we advise that said church inform the neighboring churches, and so meet all the necessary demands which may be made from isolated parts.

1902 ART. 2. We petition the Yearly Meeting of 1902 to approve of some plan by which all the isolated members could have a visit at least once a year, and enjoy the privilege of having a few meetings, and have the Gospel preached to them, believing much good could be done, members be encouraged, and sinners be warned. Answer: We think that this petition asks for more than can be reached at this time, and feel to refer to the decision of Yearly Meeting of 1893, article 1. But we recommend a more active work of the ministry.

1910 ART. 6. Will not the Yearly Meeting of 1910 urge brethren when they get calls, to adhere more strictly to article 1 of the Yearly Meeting of 1893? Answer: We, your sub-committee, decide to grant the request of the petitioners. Passed by the meeting.

1934 ART. 12. Inasmuch as we have no system at present for caring for the isolated churches, but whenever they have brethren to come to their assistance, either at communion meetings or regular meetings, that the local church is expected to bear those brethren's expenses which is causing quite a burden on many of our isolated churches, as usually their membership is small and often are a considerable distance from the main Brotherhood. A number of these local churches have only one minister and some are without any minister, and usually only have brethren to come to them once a year. Therefore we earnestly pray Yearly Meeting of 1934 to seriously consider this condition as it now exists, and ask that Standing Committee select three or five brethren to be approved by Yearly Meeting as a committee to formulate some plan whereby these isolated churches could have more meetings by brethren coming to them and would be relieved of bearing all the expense. This committee then report their plan to Yearly Meeting of 1935 for its acceptance. Answer: Request of query granted and Brethren Ezra Denlinger, Enos Eikenberry and John C. Bowser appointed as a committee to formulate a plan whereby the isolated churches can be reached. Approved by the meeting.

Church Council

1845 ART. 8. How it is considered, if brethren will rebel against the council held at council-meetings, and say, it is an abomination to God? Considered, that such a brother should be visited and exhorted, and if he would not hear and obey the admonition, he could not be held as a brother.

1845 (At the special Yearly Meeting in Indiana, 1845, question 6 was, "Whether in a council-meeting of the church the gospel will allow such as are not members to be admitted?" and the answer was: Considered, that inasmuch as our Savior directs us (Matt. XVIII.) the course we are to take with an offending brother, to tell it in the last step unto the church, it seemed to be obvious by (or in) the gospel, that those who do not belong to the church ought not to be in council.)

1855 ART. 12. How is it considered when members leave a council-meeting, before it is nearly out, in order to attend another religious meeting (not of our brethren), and when other members do not attend council-meeting at all? Considered, that all members should be punctual to attend council-meetings, and remember the apostle's admonition (Heb. x. 25): "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is;" and such as would leave council-meetings, for no other cause than above mentioned, should be earnestly reminded that "God is not the author of confusion." I. Cor. xiv. 33. In conclusion, it was deemed proper to admonish our dear brethren and sisters to observe that order and decency, in attending our council-meetings, as in all other cases, as the Word teaches us. I. Cor. xiv. 40.

1856 ART. 9. How is it considered, where there is a church with a bishop and two speakers, one authorized to baptize, etc., and the other not, and a case of difficulty occurs between two members and is brought before the church, those three ministers being present, but the two first, being relatives to the parties, they authorize the third to attend to the case and present it before the church; the question is, Would it be considered legal? Considered legal.

1857 ART. 13. What right have any two or three churches to reconsider the action of another church, and that without any representation from the church upon whose decision they sit in judgment, and then reinstate members which said church had excluded? Answer: We consider that one branch of the church has no right to restore a member to his place in the church, when he had been excluded by another branch of the church, without the concurrence of the church which excluded him.

1858 ART. 45. Have a few members of a church the privilege to appoint a church meeting, and call for the assistance of brethren in other districts, without the council of the church, or of the elders of the church? Considered, that brethren have no right to do so without counseling the elder brethren and the church.

1859 ART. 11. Inasmuch as the brethren, in Annual Council last year, in Art. 8, decided that the public practical use of the spiritual gifts, such as exhortation, teaching, doctrine, and prophesying, seem to be the duties and privileges belonging to the officers of the church; now, where the bishop, with the majority of his members, are not willing to be governed and regulated by the above decision, and where, also, some of them disregard other decisions of the Annual Conference, such as forbid holding in fellowship those who will not renounce Freemasonry, taking part in debating schools, and holding offices under the civil government, and say that the brethren, in conference last year, decided in favor of things which were not in accordance with the gospel. What shall the minority in such a church do? To whom shall they apply to have such bishop and members regulated according to the order of the brethren and the Bible? Answer: Such a minority of brethren in a church have full privilege to call brethren from another arm of the church, in order to investigate and adjust matters, upon the condition that said minority apprise the majority of their intention to call brethren, should they think it best to call for assistance from other churches.

1862 ART. 14. How is it considered when a church has several ministers of equal standing, and none of them ordained, has the housekeeper, or have the ministers, a right to call to their assistance an ordained brother, without the counsel of the church? Answer: They have not the right to do so without the counsel of the church.

1862 ART. 51. How is it considered if a member that has been excommunicated, makes application to be received again, and there is a council-meeting held, and a complaint is made against him so that he can not be received, and some one goes and tells the excommunicated member all that has been said against him in council? How is such a member to be dealt with? Answer: We consider it very wrong to report any thing done in council to such persons, except the charges made against them.

1862 ART. 55. Which is the most advisable in holding council-meetings, to ask each individual member for his consent, or to take silence for consent? Answer: In all weighty matters it is best for each member to answer.

1864 ART. 20. Is it in harmony with gospel principles, and with the practice of the church, for the housekeepers of one church district to reject the council or aid of members from neighboring districts, that have come to council or church meeting, as it is customary for brethren to do, and even tell them that they were not needed, so as to sway their council? And if it be not proper, what shall be done with brethren pursuing such a course? Answer: We consider it improper for the members of one congregation to go, without being invited by another church, and take part in their deliberations, and it is proper to inform them that their aid can be dispensed with, if it is not wanted.

1865 ART. 6. Has any church a right, according to the order of the brethren, to send a letter to the standing committee of the Yearly Meeting, demanding of them that a certain brother should have no right to assist the brethren in selecting committees that may be called for? Answer: We consider that no church has any right to make such a demand.

1865 ART. 56. Inasmuch as there is a difference in the brotherhood in holding an inquest where there is application made for baptism, and for letters of recommendation, some doing it before the whole congregation, and others doing it before the church only. It is desired that in this all the churches practice alike, as members are moving from one state to another, and such difference causes hard feelings and trouble. Answer: We consider such inquest should be held before the church only.

1866 ART. 3. Is it according to the gospel to hold church meetings in secresy, as we are commanded to take Christ for our example; and he said: "In secret have I said nothing?" John xviii. 20. Answer: It is according to the gospel, inasmuch as the Savior only says: "In secret have I said nothing." Consequently this does not prohibit us from transacting church business in secresy, his language not applying to church meetings. In holding church meetings secretly, we act according to Matt. xviii, where the Savior says: "Tell it unto the church."

1872 ART. 4. Has the church the right to enforce her decisions according to Matthew xviii., in matters where the gospel is silent? Answer: There may be evils of sufficient magnitude to require a resort to the extreme of the course we are directed to pursue in Matt. xviii., though those evils for which members are dealt with may not be specified in the gospel, but at the same time are clearly violations of the principles of the gospel.

1875 ART. 17. Why is it the custom of the brethren to hold their church council-meetings privately, while they hold their district and Annual Meetings publicly? Answer: Because the home councils are of a private character, according to Matt. xviii., while the business of the district and Annual Meetings is of a general character.

1911 ART. 1. Inasmuch as there are a good many old memmembers who think it not in order to have quarterly council, and many churches have it, and as there is nothing on the minutes in regard to it, will not this Yearly Meeting take action on this matter and say which is right, so as to be more in union? Answer: It is the prayerful conclusion of the sub-committee on the above query, that all necessary councils are in harmony with the spirit of the Gospel, and from experience we learn that permanent quarterly councils answer the welfare of the church. Passed.

Church Government

1849 ART. 26. When the church deals with a member, or members, and they are not satisfied with the proceedings of the church, whether it is in their, or in the church's place, to write to strange brethren for assistance? Considered, that the church would have to write, if any strange brethren should be called on.

1849 ART. 40. How are we to proceed, if a brother is not willing to be visited by the church, in which he lives, but claims to belong to another? Considered, that we should always be subject to the church, or district, to which we belong, as those districts are only laid off for convenience, and not to divide the body.

1850 ART. 28. How is it considered, when a district or church do not observe the ancient order of the brethren, and have new orders among them? Concluded, that no district church has any right to make changes in any thing whatsoever, contrary to ancient order, without proper investigation before, and the general consent of, the Annual Meeting.

1851 ART. 21. Whether a minister, or any other member, has a right, according to Paul's treating on self-examination, after being seated at the communion-table, to order from the table any brother or sister; or whether Paul's sentiment is to leave the member, or members, until after the communion, and then take them into the council of the church? Considered, inasmuch as the Apostle Paul writes (I. Cor. xi. 29): "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself," we think that no member should be permitted to remain at the communion-table, when he, or she, is known, to a member of the church, to have been guilty of a violation of the order of the house of God.

1853 ART. 28. How one arm of the church shall proceed toward another, in case of a departure from the general order of the church? Considered, that inasmuch as all the arms of the church are but one body in Christ, and each arm stands in the same relation to the other as an individual member stands to the other individual member; and inasmuch as an individual is not only at liberty, but commanded to go to his brother, if that brother has done something by which he considers himself grieved, in order to gain his brother to an arm of the church, feeling aggrieved at proceedings in and by another arm, has not only a right, but also a solemn duty to do likewise, and to do it either by going or writing to such arm.

1856 ART. 21. How is it considered, when a branch of a church separates itself from the main body, forwards its ministers without a bishop being present, and pretends to act independent of the counsel of the church and the Yearly Meeting? Considered, that such proceedings are wrong, and highly dangerous, so that love induces us to charge a committee to visit that church and branch.

1857 ART. 13. What right have any two or three churches to reconsider the action of another church, and that without any representation from the church upon whose decision they sit in judgment, and then reinstate members which said church had excluded? Answer: We consider that one branch of the church has no right to restore a member to his place in the church, when he had been excluded by another branch of the church, without the concurrence of the church which excluded him.

1858 ART. 45. Have a few members of a church the privilege to appoint a church meeting, and call for the assistance of brethren in other districts, without the council of the church, or of the elders of the church? Considered, that brethren have no right to do so without counseling the elder brethren and the church.

1859 ART. 16. We wish to know how to proceed with a brother, who resides in one branch of the church, but does not attend council-meetings and love-feasts in the branch in which he resides, but when there are love-feasts in the adjoining districts he attends them. Answer: Such a brother should be visited, and the cause why he does not attend the meetings in his own congregation ascertained. (See Heb. x. 23-25.) And if he should be disobedient (see Matt. xviii. 17.)

1867 ART. 1. The district of southern Ohio respectfully requests the Annual Meeting to give some more definite direction than we now have for dealing with a church that is altogether out of the order of the gospel. Answer: We think that the direction for meeting such cases as alluded to above, is contained in the minutes of last Annual Meeting, and if that direction is understood and carried out, nothing further is necessary.

1914 ART. 3. As there seems to be a difference in the brotherhood in regard to the 18th of Matthew, some making a statement at their quarterly council meetings of the 15th, 16th, and 17th verses, and then give members liberty, if any have had occasion to use the same and did not effect peace, now to tell it to the church, while others do not do so. If it is not the order of the church to make such statement, then tell us what the Savior meant when he said, "Tell it unto the church," as in the 17th verse. Answer: We, your sub-committee, agree that it has not been the established order of the church to make such statements to the church. We also agree that the Savior meant what he said and that such trespass be told directly by the aggrieved party to the church after the officials see that the two first steps have been complied with. Passed.

1874 ART. 20. If a church is dissatisfied with members that go to Sunday-school conventions, and pass a decision that members shall not go to such places, and if they do go, that they must make an acknowledgment for the same, can the church enforce such decision without the sanction of the Annual Meeting? Answer: We think it has the power.

1902 ART. 1. Inasmuch as there are some churches which have dispensed with the reading out of the Prophets or Psalms at their meetings, we believe it has always been the order of the church throughout the brotherhood to read at our regular meetings. We think there should be more of a oneness amongst us. We wish the Yearly Meeting of 1902 to give an answer to the above query. Answer: Yes. We, your sub-committee, unanimously agree that it has always been the order of our brethren to read from the Prophets or Psalms at our regular meetings, and we think that brethren who have dropped from the order that our Savior has given us, ought again re-establish the example Jesus gave in Luke 4. 16, 17; Acts 13. 14, 15; Rom. 15. 4; I. Cor. 1, 10.

1935 ART. 7. We pray this A. M. to tell us if there is any reason why we who live too far away from other districts to attend meeting elsewhere, could not have services every Sunday. Answer: We return this paper stating that we see no reason. Passed.

Christian Science and Magnetic Healing

1900 ART. 3. Inasmuch as we are living in the latter days, and in perilous times, under many and various deceptive influences, would it not be wisdom on the part of this Annual Meeting to advise and counsel our members to abstain from and stand opposed to the modern so-called "Christian Science" and "Magnetic Healing?" Because of and through and by which means and influences are used and practiced, which do not become a follower of Christ. See 1 Thess. 5. 22; Rom. 12. 2; Eph. 4. 14. Answer: Yes, and we would include all other unscriptural systems of modern introduction. "For he that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Matt. 12. 30. See also James 5. 13, 14, 15, as the only safe and divine healing.

Circulating Papers

1937 ART. 4. Is it right or according to the Gospel and the order of the Brethren to circulate signed or unsigned papers over our beloved Brotherhood seemingly to create sentiment and thereby sow discord? And if not right how and by whom shall such brethren be dealt with? Answer: To the first part, No. To second part, They should be dealt with by the congregation in which they hold their membership. Passed by the meeting.

Civil Government

1864 ART. 23. Does this Annual Meeting consider civil government of divine authority, or a mere association for mutual well being? Answer: We consider that it is of divine authority, from the testimony of the Apostle Paul. (See Rom. xiii. 1-8.)

1865 ART. 26. Is it right for ministering brethren, or for private members, to speak evil of the rulers of our land in public, and pray that God would open their eyes and change their wicked hearts? And, if it is not right, what is to be done with those who do so? Answer: We consider it wrong to do so (Acts xxiii. 5), and that brethren that have done so should make an acknowledgment for it and promise to do so no more.

1865 ART. 38. A request to reconsider Art. 23, of 1864. Answer: We consider the answer sufficient as it is.

1865 ART. 47. How are the churches to hold and proceed with those members, who, in heart and soul, have been in sympathy with the rebellion, denouncing the government, and speaking evil of our rulers, especially of President Lincoln? As many members are unwilling to commune with such, a scriptural answer is required. Answer: We consider such brethren as transgressors of the Word, and admonish them to make satisfactory acknowledgment to the church; and if they refuse to do so, they should be dealt with according to the gospel. (See Acts xxiii. 5; Rom. xiii.; II. Peter ii. 10; Titus iii. 1.)

1866 ART. 46. Resolved, that Art. 47, of the minutes of 1865, be altered to read, "The President of the United States," instead of "President Lincoln."

Class Meetings

1838 ART. 10. Whether it be right for members to take part in Sunday-shools, class-meetings, and the like? Considered most advisable to take no part in such things.

Collecting Alms

1856 ART. 10. Is it agreeable with the gospel to make public collections at public meetings, before the world, for our laboring brethren? Considered not agreeable to the gospel to hold such collections, before the world, for the above purpose.

1880 ART. 8. Do the brethren in general council endorse the practice of taking up public collections at church dedication services on Lord's day to pay for meeting-houses? Answer: we think it not advisable to do so.

1880 ART. 17. Since the gospel plainly teaches that members should give according to that which they have, and not according to that which they have not; and, whereas, some violate this gospel precept by refusing to give their portion, and to remedy said violation the church, by more than four-fifths of a majority, adopts a system by which each member's portion is fairly determined, may not said church enforce said system under pain of excommunication, according to the gospel? (II. Cor. viii. 11-14.) Answer: As God accepts the free will offering, we will not force brethren to comply with said system, but when it is plain that brethren refuse to give their proportion on account of a covetous or miserly disposition, they should be dealt with according to Matthew xviii. 17.

Colleges

1831 ART. 1. Whether it was considered advisable for a member to have his son educated in a college? Considered not advisable, inasmuch as experience has taught that such very seldom will come back afterward to the humble ways of the Lord.

1853 ART. 28. Is it right for a brother to go to college, or teach the same? Considered, that we would deem colleges a very unsafe place for a simple follower of Christ, inasmuch as they are calculated to lead us astray from the faith and obedience to the gospel.

1871 ART. 3. Does the Annual Meeting of 1871 claim Salem College, of Bourbon, Indiana, to be under the auspices of our brotherhood? Answer: It does not regard it as a church school, or conducted by the general brotherhood, though it is under the auspices of members of the church, and is supported by those who patronize it, and not by donation of the church.

1871 ART. 27. Is it advisable for a brother to serve as manager or teacher of a college or high school, as the tendency thereof is to lead many of the brethren from the simplicity that is in Christ, and also to divide the brotherhood? Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting has admitted the propriety of a high school, as a private enterprise (See Art. 51, 1868), we can not prohibit a brother from engaging in teaching in such an institution; and as it regards the fears that many entertain of the tendency of such an institution to lead brethren from the simplicity of the church, this will depend upon the character of the institution. And to guard the Salem College against any such tendency, this Annual Meeting advises the elders of the church district, in which the college is located, to take into its charge all the teachers and scholars of said college, who are members of the church, and require of them to conform to the general order of the brotherhood. See 1858, Art. 51. (School).

1874 ART. 10. Inasmuch as the brethren, when assembled in Annual Council in the year 1831, decided it not to be advisable for a brother to have his son educated in a college; "inasmuch," they say, "as experience has taught us that such very seldom will come back afterward to the humble ways of the Lord," what will this district-meeting and our Annual Meeting say when a combination of brethren are trying to get up a high school for the more thorough education of the brethren's children, and term it the "Brethren's School?" Answer: Referred to the minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1858, Art. 51. But the brethren shall not call the school the "Brethren's School, or by any other name that would involve the general brotherhood.

1881 ART. 26. Inasmuch as the high-schools are causing trouble and confusion, by their being called "Brethren's schools," we ask Annual Meeting to decide that they shall not be called by that name. Answer: Whereas, the name "Brethren's schools" has given offense to some, we decide that the name be avoided as much as expedient, and that they be called after the names of the places in which they are located.

1903 ART. 2. Inasmuch as the "Reasons" of the Old German Baptist Church is opposed to colleges or high schools, is it not wrong or inconsistent for brethren to patronize them by sending their children to them, thereby wounding the feelings of a good many brethren? What is to be done with those who disregard the advise of the Old Brethren? Answer: Considered that it is wrong and inconsistent for members to send their children to college or high school while under their control, as already agreed to in the revision of the minutes by the Old Brethren, see section 1, also minutes of 1831, article 1, which has always been the advice of our firm and faithful brethren. We further advise that members who disregard the above advice be admonished again and again. Rom. 12. 16; Psalms 131. 1; Jer. 45. 5; 1 Cor. 3. 1-5.

Colonization Society

1851 ART. 14. Whether it would be contrary to our profession, and the doctrine of Christ, to make contributions to, or become members of, the American Colonization Society, with the view of the furtherance of the liberty of the African race? Considered, that a person may contribute to the society, but not become a member.

Colored Members

1835 ART. 1 How it is viewed to receive colored people into our church? Considered, to make no difference on account of color.

1835 ART. 12. How it is considered to receive colored persons into the church? (The object of the question was not whether they should be received at all, but whether they could or must be received or treated altogether like white members). It was considered, that inasmuch as the gospel is to be preached to all nations and races, and if they come as repentant sinners, believing in the gospel of Jesus Christ, and apply for baptism, we could not consistently refuse them. But inasmuch we receive our fellow members with the holy kiss, and there is a repugnance in some of our white members to salute colored persons in this manner, the colored members should bear with that weakness, and not offer the kiss to such weak members until they become stronger, and make the first offer, etc. Otherwise, if they (the colored members) prove faithful, they should be considered on an equality of full membership.

1845 ART. 2. In regard to receiving colored members into the church, it was considered, to leave it to the counsel of every individual church, as it is done in all cases; but if colored persons are once received as members into the church, the members should be at liberty to salute them in like manner as white members, at the same time having patience with those who may be weak in the faith, and can not do so. The assembled elders, however, consider it as the more perfect way, to which we all should strive to come, viz., that love, which makes no distinction in the brotherhood, in this respect. (See James II. 1-10.)

1849 ART. 31. How are we to conduct, with colored members, at communions? Considered, that this ought to be left to the individual churches, in which such members are, only that these ought not to be debarred from the Lord's table, on account of their color.

1866 ART. 28. Should not colored members be held equal with white members in church privileges? Answer: We refer to minutes of 1835, Art. 1; and 1845, Art. 2; and 1849, Art. 31.

1874 ART. 21. As there is not a uniformity of practice among the brethren in reference to saluting our colored members, will not the brethren in Annual Council give us a decision that will enable us to be one in practice, and not be respecters of persons? Answer: We think it best to make no change in this matter.

1875 ART. 27. Since the Annual Meeting has left it optional with brethren whether or not to salute colored brethren with the holy kiss, designing men are making capital of it against us. To obviate this, let the Annual Meeting reconsider that decision, and say that we make no difference on account of race or color; and this district-meeting asks the Annual Meeting to make no difference on account of race or color. Answer: We grant the request, but should have regard to the former minutes of Annual Meetings upon the subject, and advise the brethren to bear with one another.

Committees

1852 ART. 5. Respecting the publication of the names of the special committees in the minutes, it was considered advisable not to insert so many names.

1852 ART. 15. The committee appointed last year to visit Salamony Church, in this state (Indiana), in order to settle the difficulties there, reported that they could not yet accomplish the object of their appointment, but that there was now a prospect of doing it, and request some more brethren to be added. Concluded, that this committee should be reappointed, with the addition of James Tracey, of Elkhart, and Jacob Miller, of Portage.

Committees: Duties of

1858 ART. 15. Would it not be agreeable to the gospel, and the order of the brethren, when the standing committee appoints committees to go to other churches to settle difficulties, to authorize such brethren that circumstances will not permit to attend such council, to send some other ordained brethren in their places, so that there will be a full committee? Considered, that it is the duty of such brethren, that can not go, to appoint others in their places, that the committee may be full.

1862 ART. 44. Is it according to the word of God when a committee of brethren come into a church or district to examine and settle difficulties, to withdraw before they have heard the members in church council, or to withdraw afterward, and then hear each member separately, and then decide without giving the members concerned any knowledge of it or any opportunity to answer complaints made against them? Answer: We consider that it should be left optional with the committee, after having the parties face to face.

1865 ART. 2. Which would be nearest to the gospel, and the order of the church, when a committee is chosen to settle a difficulty, to make known the accusation to the accused and to the church before the committee withdraws, or to withhold it from him and a part of the church till the committee has heard the witnesses and made their decision and report? Answer: The accusation should be made known to the church and the accused, and the accusers and the accused should be face to face, that the latter may have liberty to answer for himself, according to Acts XXV. 16.

1876 ART. 7. We respectfully ask the Annual Meeting, through the district-meeting, to say what course should be pursued when a committee from the Annual Meeting has been sent to adjust matters in a congregation where there are two elders, between whom some unkindness and want of social relations exist, yet no grave charge against either. Is it legitimate to suspend them at home only, and to put in authority over said church an unordained brother, and hold church and officers amendable to said committee until said elders cultivate social relations with each other, with the promise by said committee that as soon as these conditions are complied with, all should be restored; and when elders have complied, for said committee to withdraw their connection from said church, and leave it in that unorganized condition? Answer: In reference to the above subject we would say that we can not accept of the answer given by the district-meeting, but would say, that in view of the known conditions of the case, we submit it to the church involved in the trouble, and the five following elders: Isaac Long, Jacob Thomas, Solomon Garber, Jacob Wine, and Martin Garber.

1880 ART. 27. Has any committee of elders a right, according to Paul's instructions to Timothy (I. Tim. v. 19), to receive accusations against an elder without witnesses? And if so, is it right for them, after going through an investigation of such accusations, and finding them unsustained, to drop the matters without asking anything of the accuser? Answer: No.

Committees Discontinued

1935 ART. 4. Inasmuch as committees that are being sent out by our A. M. to various churches of our brotherhood to settle troubles, and especially some that are of such nature that ought to be settled under the instructions of the Savior's teaching, are causing much dissatisfaction and discouragement among many of our dear members, and inasmuch as we have no record in the early age of the church of practicing such a custom before the year 1852, and from that time up to 1881 the committees that were sent were to settle disturbances which were principally of a doctrinal nature, we now, in view of the above, ask this A. M. of 1935 to seriously consider the propriety of such a custom and to fall in line with the petition that was sent to A. M. of 1869 and signed by many of our faithful fathers. See Brethren's Reasons, page 15, which reads as follows: "We petition conference to desist from sending committees to the various churches where difficulties exist. We advise that all churches who need assistance call upon the elders, etc., in adjoining districts to come to their help, for it is probable that in most cases these have a better knowledge of the case than those brethren sent to them from a distance. And let all cases where any of the ordinances or doctrinal points are involved be reported to conference, and let conference, after having considered the case, write accordingly to the church where the difficulty exists. Let two brethren be chosen to carry and deliver the epistle to said church. This will be according to the practice of the apostles' days, for proof of which see the fifteenth chapter of Acts."

Answer: We your sub-committee unanimously agree to grant the request of the query. Passed.

Committees: Expenses of

1858 ART. 13. If the churches demand committees by the Annual Meeting, to visit them to settle difficulties among them, would it be advisable for said churches to defray the expenses of said committees. Answer: The churches calling committees should defray the traveling expenses.

1870 ART. 3. As there has been a petition presented to this Annual Meeting for a committee to go to California and Oregon to organize churches, and to set things in order, the meeting appointed Bro. Jacob Miller, of Portage, and Bro. D. Sturgis, of South Bend, Indiana, as the committee. It was also concluded to make provisions to defray the expenses of the committee, which it was supposed would be about three hundred dollars. Bro. Christian Wenger was appointed receiver to receive the funds collected. His address is South Bend, St. Joseph County, Indiana. To further the collection of said funds, the elders were recommended to lay the subject before their congregations.

1873 ART. 14. When churches or individuals call for committees, shall the party calling for the committee pay the expenses of said committee, or shall the committee say which party shall pay the expenses? Answer: We think the committee shall say who shall pay the expenses.

1873 ART. 21. Inasmuch as ofttimes the innocent party must call for a committee and bear all expenses, would it not be more just for the committee to decide who is to pay the expenses? Answer: We think the committee is to decide.

1874 ART. 27. We desire the reconsideration of Art. 14, of the last Annual Meeting. The query was, whether the committee should not have the right to say who should pay the expenses of called committees, the one that called them, or the church in which the difficulty existed; and it was decided that the committee should have that authority. Answer: We reaffirm the decision of the Annual Meeting of last year in the reconsideration of said query.

1874 The following is the quota of each state district to defrey the expenses of the committee to California: Tennessee, $15; Virginia, first district, $30, second district, $45, third district, $25; Maryland, eastern district, $30, western district, $30; Pennsylvania, eastern district, $40, middle district, $35, western district, $40; Ohio, northeastern district, $40, northwestern district, $30, southwestern district, $50; Indiana, northern district, $40, middle district, $40, southern district, $40; Illinois, northern district, $25; Iowa, northern district, $10, middle district, $10, southern district, $5; Missouri, northern district, $5, southern district, $10; Nebraska, $5; Kansas, $5; Michigan, $5. The collections in Pennsylvania and Maryland will be remitted to D. P. Sayler; those in Virginia and Tennessee to B. F. Moomaw; those in the western states to H. D. Davy. The money should be collected and remitted by the first of September.

1879 ART. 8. Will the Middle District of Indiana request the Annual Meeting to consider the impropriety of sending committees such a great distance to transact business unless necessity requires it, thereby incurring unnecessary expense upon those that are not able to pay said expenses? Answer: We ask the Annual Meeting to consider the impropriety of making unnecessary expenses. This answer passed the Annual Meeting, with the understanding that the request of the district meeting is granted.

Committees: Investigating

1908 ART. 1. Would it not be advisable when the Yearly Meeting sends a committee of brethren to investigate or settle difficulties in any local church, for such committees to report the result of their effort to the next Yearly Meeting? Answer: Yes, this Yearly Meeting considers it advisable for such committees to report to the next Yearly Meeting.

1865 ART. 2. Which would be nearest to the gospel, and the order of the church, when a committee is chosen to settle a difficulty, to make known the accusation to the accused and to the church before the committee withdraws, or to withhold it from him and a part of the church till the committee has heard the witnesses and made their decision and report? Answer: The accusation should be made known to the church and the accused, and the accusers and the accused should be face to face, that the latter may have liberty to answer for himself, according to Acts XXV. 16.

Committees: Power of

1865 ART. 5. Have committees, appointed to investigate difficulties in churches other than the church in which they hold their membership, the power to disown members in the absence of the church council, or without consultation with the elders of the church in which the difficulty exists? Answer: We consider that they have no such power.

1866 ART. 4. If an elder rejects the decisions or counsel of a committee sent by the Annual Meeting, the majority of the church sustaining him, what course should be pursued to bring him to submit? Answer: We consider it wrong for an elder, with a part of the church, to reject the decision of a committee sent by the Annual Meeting; but in such a case the minority should have the privilege to apply for the same, or another committee.

1867 ART. 31. Should not the Annual Meeting adopt some definite rule with regard to the action of special committees asked for by any branch of the church, to settle matters that could not be settled otherwise? Answer: Whereas, it is the privilege of any branch of the church, or member, to have a committee when asked for, such committee should have full power to dispose of any case submitted to it, provided the usual methods have been resorted to previously; and when settled by such committee, the decision shall be final. Acts XV. 22.

1869 ART. 13. Would it not be well for all committees called to settle difficulties in churches to keep a record of their proceedings, signed by the committee, and also by competent members of the church in which said committee acted for reference? Answer: We think they should keep a record, from the fact that so much misunderstanding occurs without it. A duplicate of the proceedings should also be left with the church, if it desires.

1874 ART. 15. Will this district-meeting ask the Annual Meeting to decide that when a committee is sent by the Annual Meeting into any district to settle difficulties, and elders or other members are involved, more or less, in the trouble to be settled, and who live in adjoining or other districts, that it may have the right to call such into the district into which the committee is called, and there settle the difficulties of those called? Or, should the committee go into the district and there hear and decide the case, that a final settlement of the trouble may be effected? Answer: All committees may have the power asked for in the query, to call for such persons as are alluded to.

1875 ART. 28. If a member is disowned, and gets a committee to investigate his case, and that committee justifies the church in the course it has taken, has that committee the right to reinstate that member without consulting the church? Answer: No.

1876 ART. 10. A request that the Annual Meeting limit the power of committees, so as not to allow them to expel a majority of any church, unless their decision is ratified by the Annual Meeting in open session. Answer: The request is granted.

1877 ART. 10. **Whereas, we deem fairness honorable in all** cases, and feeling aggrieved at the way the question of feet-washing has been treated, we wish to know whether it is right for the Standing Committee to take queries that have been answered by district meetings, and change the answers, and then bring their answers before the meetings and put them on the minutes without being passed by the Annual Meeting? Answer: No; we think not.—This answer was given by the District Meeting. Then when the subject came before the Annual Meeting the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That as there is a charge against the Standing Committee, we appoint a committee to ascertain whether the charge is true.

A committee was appointed and the following is its report, which was accepted and passed by Annual Meeting:

TO THE ANNUAL MEETING:—We, your committee appointed to investigate the above charge against the Standing Committee of last year, would say, that if the charge was sustained against said committee, it would be responsible for transcending its prerogatives; but inasmuch as the action taken, and answer given, was upon a query to which no answer was given by district meeting, we find that the charge is not fully sustained; and, whereas, it is claimed by the complainant that inasmuch as the promise was given by the Standing Committee through its chairman in 1875, that if they would bring their query in proper form to the next Annual Meeting, they should be heard, and then when so brought the committee of 1876 suppressed it with its answer, and put their own answer to a similar query upon the minutes which did not pass the meeting.

In this we find that the query in question, with its answer, was read before the meeting, and also the query which had no answer from the district meeting, with the answer of the Standing Committee, the whole matter was now brought before the meeting and freely discussed in the presence of the representatives of the complainant, whose right it was to have moved the consideration of their petition. The query and answer submitted by the Standing Committee failing to pass, it was decided to defer it. The answer, however, was put upon the minutes, which, in our judgment, was wrong, but for this wrong we find the clerk responsible, and not chargeable to the Standing Committee. B. F. Moomaw, Jacob Berkey, J. W. Brumbaugh.

1880 ART. 26. When difficulties in a church have been disposed of by a legal course of procedure, all implicated parties making satisfactory acknowledgments, and all the members present openly and audibly, one by one,, expressing themselves satisfied, does Annual Meeting authorize committees (sent by that body) to hear and investigate such matters at the request of only a few of those members that expressed themselves, as above stated, and in opposition to the body of the church? And if so, what encouragement have churches to make every effort to settle their own difficulties, which has been the advice of Annual Meetings? Answer: Let the committee determine their duty according to the facts before them.

1908 ART. 1. Would it not be advisable when the Yearly Meeting sends a committee of brethren to investigate or settle difficulties in any local church, for such committees to report the result of their effort to the next Yearly Meeting? Answer: Yes, this Yearly Meeting considers it advisable for such committees to report to the next Yearly Meeting.

1927 ART. 7. When there is a petition sent to the Annual Meeting requesting a committee to be sent to a local church to adjust troubles, is it not just and in order that the Standing Committee hold an interview with both the accused and the accuser before a final decision is made to send a committee to the church involved?

Answer: Yes, if possible. Passed.

1927 ART. 8. Will this Annual Meeting say whether or not it is just and right for an investigating committee to receive either damaging or established charges against an elder or any other brethren and then make no record nor statement of their findings on said charges in their report?

Answer: Considered not right. Passed.

1928 ART. 5. (1) Inasmuch as committees that are being sent out by Annual Meeting to settle difficulties, use the authority to expel all members who do not accept their report within 30 or 90 days (which is without Gospel authority and also contrary to minutes of 1876, Art. 10).

We therefore pray that Annual Meeting of 1928, say that no committee has the right to expel any member for not accepting its report until the committee's work has been ratified by Annual Meeting.

(2) We request that committees that are sent by Annual Meeting to adjust difficulties in local churches, shall not connect a penalty of expulsion from the church to members that do not feel to accept their decision; but all members implicated that will not accept, shall be out of communion until their decision is presented to Annual Meeting, and if accepted all shall submit to be in full fellowship. Answer: We feel to grant the request of both the above queries with this addition: That all members not accepting the decision of a committee will be out of communion until the committee's decision is ratified by Annual Meeting, then those not accepting will be out of fellowship. Passed.

1929 ART. 2. This query asks Annual Meeting through Standing Committee of 1929, to reestablish the Ancient Order of not granting a committee to petitioners that live outside of the district where the local trouble was. Neither the minutes nor circumstances in the past show that any committee was sent in violation to our Ancient Order until 1927. See minutes of 1863, Art. 29.

Answer: This Annual Meeting decides to defer this query indefinitely.

1931 ART. 4. Inasmuch as the A. M. of 1874, Art. 27, empowers committees to say who shall pay the expenses of called committees, and since they fail to do this in many cases, we ask this A. M. to say that in all cases the signers of the petition for the committee, pay the expenses of such called committees if they are able, thereby relieving the committee of this responsibility. Answer: This A. M. of 1931 readopts Art. 14, 1873. Passed.

Committees: Composed of:

1875 ART. 14. Whereas, there are many committees called for every year, would it not be advisable for the standing committee of the Annual Meeting to be careful, and not to select too many from their own body, as it might appear to some as if they would like to do all the business themselves? Answer: We advise as Paul does, when he says: "Observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality."

Committees—Qualifications

1881 ART. 15. The Southern District of Illinois hereby petitions Annual Meeting to send only such brethren on committees to settle difficulties in churches who are in the general order of the brotherhood in dress and in the wearing of the hair. Answer: Agreed to by Annual Meeting.

1881 ART. 16. We request Annual Meeting, through district meeting, to send only such brethren as delegates and members of the Standing Committee, and to settle difficulties, who are sound in faith, and who carry out and advocate the order of the church in wearing the clothes, hair, and beard, as well as in everything else, with the understanding that they will be rejected if not sent in harmony with the above. Answer: Brethren who opposed the established order of the church are not suitable brethren to settle troubles in the church, or to represent as delegates.

1934 ART. 13. (1) In view of what our past experience has taught us, in sending committees from Annual Meeting to local districts, and after the investigation all parties implicated having accepted the report and made all concessions to the satisfaction of the committee, we earnestly pray this A. M. to say that all parties accepting the report, together with the committee, should not give voice in the passage of the report at the next A. M. (2) Will this Yearly Meeting of 1934 place it on the minutes that it is right and proper that when committee reports have been accepted where the investigations have been made, that none of those accepting at home shall have voice objecting at Yearly Meeting, remembering that genuine acceptance of committee's labors for the church is sacred.

(3) When committees are sent by A. M. to investigate difficulties and restore peace and union in local congregations, and inasmuch as these efforts and reports are met with much opposition, we pray the A. M. of 1934 to adopt the following: When a call to A. M. has been made and a committee has been selected and sent out to investigate matters and have been accepted to work, and their report being read and accepted by all concerned, when this report comes before A. M. the congregation which has been dealt with should have no voice or remain silent (unless called upon for explanation) as the same applies in local councils.

(4) Inasmuch as A. M. sends out committees to investigate and tries to adjust all troubles and differences existing in local districts, Therefore, when said committee performs its labor, according to the Gospel and our established order and makes its report to the District for acceptance, all who accept said report shall have no right to afterward object to its being accepted by A. M. All who do not accept may bring their reasons for not accepting to A. M. for consideration if so worded that Standing Committee could think it proper to read before the public, but shall have no voice in the decision made thereon by A. M. We pray our beloved Brotherhood to adopt the above in order to stop confusion and future controversies thereon. Also reaffirm Art. 5, Minutes of 1928.

Answer: We grant the request of the last query, as this answer covers the others submitted upon the same subject. Passed.

Committees: Calling for

1870 ART. 5. Inasmuch as excommunicated persons do frequently, under the present system of our Annual Council, call for committees to reconsider their cases, and that most generally to the dissatisfaction of the church where such cases originated, will not this district-meeting petition our Annual Conference to consider this matter, and decide that all such requests for a rehearing shall be made to the elders in adjoining districts; and as they have more or less knowledge of the case, let them consider the propriety of giving such persons a rehearing? This query being taken to the Annual Meeting for further consideration, received the following answer: Answer: This meeting judges it best to make no change from the present practice of the brotherhood in the subject referred to in the preceding query, but it thinks that the Annual Meeting should be very careful in appointing committees, and appoint none but what are absolutely required.

1866 ART. 11. There being a considerable number of persons in Tennessee, belonging to a body of professing Christians, known as the J. A. Bowman Church, he having been at one time in fellowship with the brethren. This body expressed a wish to our brethren in Tennessee to become united to the brethren, and a committee of brethren in Tennessee was appointed to confer with the J. A. Bowman Church relative to a union; but the brethren in Tennessee preferred to submit the case to the Annual Meeting, and it appointed the following brethren as a committee to visit the J. A. Bowman Church to confer with it, and receive it into fellowship with us, if judged proper to do so: J. P. Ebersole and H. D. Davy, of Ohio; John Metzger and C. Long, of Illinois; Jacob Miller and J. Bowman, of Indiana; J. Wise and D. M. Holsinger, of Pennsylvania; D. P. Sayler and H. Koontz, of Maryland; Daniel Thomas and Solomon Garver, of Virginia.

1877 ART. 15. Whereas, committees have been called from Annual Meeting without first asking consent of the arm of the church to be visited by the committees, thereby causing hard feelings, will this district meeting decide to ask Annual Meeting to refuse to send committees on the petition of members who refuse or neglect to first ask the consent of the arm visited, and thereby failing to apprise the church of their desire before they get a petition with signers to obtain a committee. Answer: We request Annual Meeting to decide that all parties desiring a committee shall first ask the consent of the arm of the church to be visited, and if refused consent then they may petition Annual Meeting. The Annual Meeting decides as requested.

1878 ART. 20. When a brother is expelled from the church and he thinks not altogether fairly, and makes an attempt to have a re-hearing, both by personal effort and by a committee recommended by the district meeting, but fails in both instances, and finds himself too poor to go before the Standing Committee of Annual Meeting, or pay the expense of a committee of that body, what shall be done in his case? Answer: He should call on the brethren who are acquainted with his case to help him. And as we learn there is such a case in Cherokee Church, Tennessee, we appoint Henry Garst, Henry Brubaker, and Abraham Malsbee to go and settle the trouble.

1876 ART. 23. Whereas, we have a query from No. 1 district of Virginia, one from West Virginia, one from the middle district of Indiana, and one from the southern district of Indiana, requesting the Annual Meeting to grant the district meetings power to send committees to settle difficulties in the churches; therefore, resolved, that we decide to make no change in this respect, believing our present manner of sending committees is preferable to the one proposed.

Committees: Selecting

1879 ART. 2. Would it not be advisable for the Annual Meeting to adopt a rule for the aggrieved, instead of petitioning the Annual Meeting for a committee to choose one deacon, and the church in defense to choose another deacon, and these two to choose a third deacon as a committee to settle all difficulties except doctrinal points, said selection of deacons to be made out of the adjoining churches, thereby curtailing the expenses of the Annual Meeting? But if the above is not adopted, would it not be advisable and consistent for the Annual Meeting to send deacons to settle all difficulties except doctrinal points, instead of sending elders and ministers, thereby saving their reputation? Answer: We decide it best to make no new rules in regard to such cases as are referred to in the query.

1880 ART. 15. Will the Southern District of Indiana ask Annual Meeting to grant the district the privilege of appointing committees to settle difficulties, and therefore lessen the labor of Annual Meeting. But in case that said committee fails to settle the difficulty, then either party can appeal to Annual Meeting for a committee, whose decision shall be final? Answer: The district meeting does ask Annual Meeting to grant said petition. The above petition was granted by Annual Meeting.

1935 ART. 4. Inasmuch as committes that are being sent out by our A. M. to various churches of our brotherhood to settle troubles, and especially some that are of such nature that ought to be settled under the instructions of the Savior's teaching, are causing much dissatisfaction and discouragement among many of our dear members, and inasmuch as we have no record in the early age of the church of practicing such a custom before the year 1852, and from that time up to 1881 the committees that were sent were to settle disturbances which were principally of a doctrinal nature, we now, in view of the above, ask this A. M. of 1935 to seriously consider the propriety of such a custom and to fall in line with the petition that was sent to A. M. of 1869 and signed by many of our faithful fathers. See Brethren's Reasons, page 15, which reads as follows: "We petition conference to desist from sending committees to the various churches where difficulties exist. We advise that all churches who need assistance call upon the elders, etc., in adjoining districts to come to their help, for it is probable that in most cases these have a better knowledge of the case than those brethren sent to them from a distance. And let all cases where any of the ordinances or doctrinal points are involved be reported to conference, and let conference, after having considered the case, write accordingly to the church where the difficulty exists. Let two brethren be chosen to carry and deliver the epistle to said church. This will be according to the practice of the apostles' days, for proof of which see the fifteenth chapter of Acts."

1937 ART. 8. Since Article 4 of the minutes of 1935 is not satisfactory in that it misconstrues the incentive of the fathers that sent the petition to the A. M. of 1869 whereby they requested a change to the old established order of calling the adjoining elders when necessary to settle difficulties in local churches before appealing to A. M. for a committee which was dispensed with automatically when district meetings were established in 1856. See Art. 23, Minutes of 1856, also Minutes of 1866. They were not opposed to sending investigating committees. As proof see Art. 2, Minutes of 1882, also Reconsidered Minutes, Sec. 23. Hence, we pray this A. M. to re-adopt the old method of adjusting difficulties; first, by the local church endeavoring to settle its own difficulties; and if it fails, then to call the adjoining elders; and if they also fail, then call for a committee from A. M. whose work shall be final if accepted by A. M.

Answer: We recommend that the 1935 decision, article 4, be left as it is, and that in place of Annual Meeting sending out committees, each of the parties in a difficulty select two or more, and those selected choose another to make an odd number who shall hear the troubles and make a decision which shall be final; the church, however, to make the decision if possible. Passed by the meeting.

1942 ART. 1. Inasmuch as it has become evident that our present method of selecting investigating committees does not reach every condition we offer the following:

We reaffirm Article 8, 1937, with the following amendment: When a church becomes involved in difficulties that it can not become reconciled with the assistance of adjoining elders, and one part of the members wants to select a committee according to Article 8, 1937, but the other part will not consent to do so, then the part which is willing for a committee, select their two elders, and then come to the next A. M. through the Standing Committee, giving the names of the elders that they have selected. It shall then be the duty of the Standing Committee to select two more elders (selecting not more than one of their own number) who shall act in harmony with the two already selected. It shall be understood that Standing Committee shall not hold this in their own hands but shall report the same to the A. M., not to be discussed in open council, but only to inform A. M. as to what has been done.

These four elders shall now select one more elder, and the five shall constitute the committee to go into said district and adjust their difficulties.

Furthermore, should a local church district become out of order in the general practice and order of the Brotherhood to the extent that it is beyond the reach of the adjoining elders, then let the adjoining elders of said district select two elders as a part committee and present to the A. M., through the Standing Committee, their procedure. The Standing Committee shall then proceed as above stated, in the selection of a committee to go into said district and set things in order.

It is to be understood that said committee shall not be required to ask the local church to accept it as a committee or as to who is to make the decision, with the understanding that the work of the committee is to be final without asking the local church to accept its report, and it shall not report back to A. M. for its acceptance.

Answer: Request granted. Passed by the meeting.

1861 ART. 19. As to the mode of setting apart suitable brethren for the proposed Pacific mission, we recommend that the vote of the whole church be taken, and that the two brethren receiving the vote of the greatest number of churches shall be declared elected, and if either of them could not go, then the next highest, etc.; and we further recommend that all the churches take immediate action, and report to the corresponding secretary of the board appointed for that purpose. For information, refer to the minutes of last Yearly Meeting (1860.)

1871 ART. 15. Would it not render more general satisfaction if churches which have difficulties to settle would, when they fail to settle them, call upon the elders in the adjoining churches to come to their assistance; and if, in case a committee be after that needed, let them apply to their annual district-meeting, instead of our General Conference, for said committee, and let it be selected from the churches which compose said district-meeting, saving much expenses, etc.? Answer: We think it best to make no change in regard to the authority for appointing committees to make a final settlement of difficulties.

1873 ART. 16. Will this district-meeting petition the Annual Meeting to grant the right to districts, at their meetings, to appoint, if necessary, committees to investigate and settle difficulties that may exist within the bounds of the district, and such selections to be made of brethren residing within the limits of the district in which such difficulties may exist, except in cases in which a majority of the churches composing a district are involved? Answer: We think it best to make no change from our present practice in selecting committees.

1875 ART. 25. We request this meeting, and the Annual Meeting, to agree to grant the power to the established districts of the states to choose their committees to settle difficulties, instead of the Annual Meeting, thereby saving expense and much labor in brethren traveling east and west. Sometimes business must also lie over for six or eight months, until brethren can get around. Answer: We can not consistently grant the power asked for, without repealing former decisions of the Annual Meeting.

Communion

1819 ART. 2. Whether we could break the bread (of communion) without having a supper? We hold, that we ought by all means in all the exercises (ordinances) look to the testimony of Jesus and his example; for the Lord Jesus, shortly before his suffering, when he instituted the Lord's Supper, etc., after he had washed his disciples' feet, he did eat the supper with them, where he also dipped the sop, and gave it to Judas. (See John XIII. 26.) And Mark XIV. 18: "And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, one of you which eateth with me shall betray me." And verse 22: "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: this is my body," etc.

1821 ART. 3. How far brethren have liberty to commune with men who do not strictly adhere to the truth, was considered in council, thus: That it is very dangerous to commune with such people as do not hold entirely the doctrine of Christ, since the apostle says, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not in your house, neither bid him Godspeed" (II John, 10; and the counsel is, to give them no liberty to speak in our meetings.

1822 ART. 11. Whether we might have two tables at love-feast, and also at other meetings; that is, whether members might prepare something warm for the old brethren, and also elderly and weakly members, besides what is served up for all in general—was considered, that members should be at perfect liberty to show their love toward their old brethren or weakly members, to set before them what they like; yet we would counsel in love to be careful that no bad distinction is made, so that friends and well-wishers are preferred to those that are weakly.

1822 ART. 14. Concerning breaking up in the morning after love-feast, it was considered that members and their children who stay till morning, should not separate and leave until prayer and thanksgiving to God is had.

1830 ART. 1. Whether a minister may break the bread of communion and communicate the cup of thanksgiving to a sick person who is not a member? Considered, as contrary to our faith and conscience, and as more advisable to point or direct the sick to Christ and inward communion. Another question presented and answered, that sick persons, who wish to be baptized, but feel too weak, might be received under the promise, that if restored to health they would submit to the command and ordinance of Christ, and in case of their death they may find comfort in the reflection that God sees their good intentions, and may accept them for the deed.

1833 ART. 4. Whether a person may be admitted to our (communion or) breaking of bread, who is not baptized according to gospel (as we understand it)? Considered, no.

1834 ART. 10. How it is considered when a brother, not yet ordained, should administer the communion in presence of ordained brethren? (If the ordained brethren desire him to do so, there can be no objection; on the contrary, it is desirable for young hands in any work to have more experienced friends near to advise or assist.)

1834 ART. 1. How it is considered to sing at or during the breaking of bread? Considered, as not proper, but at the distribution of the cup very proper. It was also remarked, that there should be no drinking without necessity while the supper is served, until all is served up, and a blessing asked of God, because we are to "tarry for one another."

1841 ART. 8. Whether a teacher has a right to break the bread of communion to a sick person that is not a member of the church? Considered, that a teacher has not any authority in the gospel to do so, but that he should direct such a soul to the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, and to the terms and promises of the gospel.

1844 ART. 9. What to do in case a member, on a sick or deathbed, requests to have the bread of communion broken unto? Considered, that the word of God does not seem to us to justify the breaking of the bread of communion to an individual member (for where there is but one, there can be no communion), and that therefore we would be more safe to direct such a member to the grace and mercy of God in Christ Jesus, and to the advice of the apostle (James V. 14), where he says: "Is any sick among you, let thim call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord," etc. If they still insist upon partaking of the bread and wine, in remembrance of their dying Savior, they might be gratified, as it has been done heretofore, if there should be a love-feast in the neighborhood, by sending to them of the blessed bread and wine, or by holding a small love-feast at the right time and in the proper order at their houses.

1849 ART. 11. Is it proper for a member of the church of the Brethren in Christ to commune with other religious societies; and if not considered proper, how shall the church proceed with a member that violates its order? We consider, that we can not, consistently with the views we entertain of the gospel order, commune with other societies; and if any of our members should do so, they ought to be tenderly admonished, and given to understand that the brethren can not hold them in fellowship, if they continue to do so.

1849 ART. 35. Whether it would not be more consistent with the Word, if, at the communion, the administrator would give the bread and cup to the sisters, and they divide it, like the brethren, among themselves, and the administrator to pass along, to keep order? Considered, unanimously, to go on, in celebrating the communion, as heretofore.

1851 ART. 12. Whether it is according to the gospel for brethren to administer the communion to a sick or disabled member, in the daytime, and without celebrating the other ordinances connected with it? Considered, not to be according to the gospel.

1854 ART. 22. A request that the oldest bishop choose or appoint twelve brethren to hold a communion or love-feast at the time (and place) of Yearly Meeting, as a model, to show us the right order, according to the gospel. Considered, that Christ with his apostles, in that doleful night when He (the Savior) was betrayed, has given a model, and showed us the right order.

1857 ART. 9. Why do not the sisters break the bread, and pass the cup to each other, in the same manner as the brethren do, at the communion? Answer: Man being the head of the woman, and it having been the practice of the church, from time immemorial, for the officiating brethren to break the bread to the sisters, we know of no scriptural reason for making a change in our practice.

1858 ART. 17. Is it right for a speaker to sing a hymn, or a part of a hymn, at the time of the communion, when the wine is passing around? Considered, it is right to do so.

1861 ART.8. Is it according to the gospel for brethren to administer the communion to the sick and disabled members in the day time, and without celebrating the other ordinances connected with it? Considered, not according to the gospel, because the Master instituted it in the night. However, there is no impropriety in attending to it, if done in the regular way and at the proper time, in connection with the other ordinances instituted with it.

1862 ART. 68. How shall we proceed in case a sick member requests the communion? Will any time do? And must feet-washing and the supper accompany the communion? Answer: We consider it best to administer it in the evening, according to the example of Christ. John XIII.

1864 ART. 26. Is it consistent with the gospel for the bread and wine to be on the table with the supper, if a majority of any branch of the church thinks it well to have it so? We think, in case of any change being desired in the established order in any branch of the church, especially with regard to the communion, it would always be best and safest, for the preservation of love and union, to take no steps in any change of this kind until the whole church is united, and neighboring churches or the district meeting consulted.

1865 ART. 16. As some brethren are of the opinion that the communion should be observed more frequently, say three or more times in a year, what is the counsel of this meeting in regard to it? Answer: We think it should be submitted to the discretion of each arm of the church to have as many as two or three in a year, but we exhort brethren in this, as in all other cases, to guard against extremes.

1868 ART. 24. Would it not be more in accordance with the example of Christ and his disciples, when the administrator is blessing the bread and wine in the communion, for all members to keep their seats? Answer: Inasmuch as it is not said that Christ did not rise to his feet, and as it has been the order of the brethren to rise when we give thanks, we think it best to make no change.

1870 ART. 28. Will the brethren of this Annual Council take into consideration the importance of having the bread and wine on the table at supper, so as to harmonize with the gospel? Answer: We think it best to adopt the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1864, Art. 26, which reads as follows: "We think, in case of any change being desired in the established order, in any branch of the church, especially with regard to the communion, it would always be best and safest, for the preservation of love and union, to take no steps in any change of this kind, until the whole church is agreed, or the district meeting is consulted."

1872 ART. 3. Are members justifiable in refusing to commune with bishops of other churches who tolerate pride in their churches, when the Annual Meeting makes it their duty to enforce plainness? Answer: Not until it is understood that the elders who are said to have tolerated the evil alluded to have been admonished and labored with, to get them in order.

1879 ART. 7. From I. Corinthians x. 16, 17 and Galatians iii. 28 would it not be more consistent with the gospel for sisters to break the bread and pass the cup of communion as the brethren do? If so, we ask the district meeting and Annual Meeting to grant the privilege. This district meeting can not unanimously agree to ask a change, and therefore submit it to the Annual Meeting. Answer: This Annual Meeting decides that it can not make any change.

1880 ART. 5. Inasmuch as we are opposed to adding to or diminishing from the word of God, would it not be best at our communions to give thanks before the breaking of bread, instead of giving thanks after it? Returned to the church originating it, because it was not sufficiently explicit.

1882 ART. 14. Will not this meeting decide that all the different branches of our church do, at their love-feasts or communions, commune only with such as have taken their stand with the Old Order Brethren Church? Answer: We refer to Article 25 of 1850, as a sufficient answer to the above.

1896 ART. 2. In case a brother is on his death bed, and requests the church to hold communion meeting at his house after he has been anointed, would it be contrary to the gospel to do so? Answer: We think it not contrary to the gospel to do so, inasmuch as the Savior said, "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." John xiii. 17. See also 1 Corinthians xi. 26.

1904 ART. 5. How is it considered by the Yearly Meeting when members move from one church to another and can not get their church letter on account of disobedience, and in the meantime the church into which they have moved has a communion; has the latter church a right to allow those disobedient members to commune before they have obtained their church letter, knowing the former church has complaints against them? Answer: We, the standing committee, advise that such members be advised not to commune anywhere until satisfaction is rendered. Passed by the general council.

1915 ART. 1. Inasmuch as there are two ways practiced in our brotherhood of disposing of what is left over from our love-feast meetings (one by the visit brethren putting a reasonable price on each article or articles, the other by selecting a brother or neighbor to call for bids and sell to the highest bidder), let us have one way and order. "God's house is a house of order." Answer: We, your sub-committee, decide that this matter be given into the hands of the visit brethren first to give to the poor, then to leave it to the visit brethren to dispose of the remainder as they may see fit, but to make no public sale. Passed.

1917 ART. 1. Is it right, according to the Gospel for members to go into other districts and commune when they are not in condition to commune at home on account of charges being preferred against them? And has a brother the right to represent his church as a messenger to Yearly Meeting under above circumstances? Answer: We, your sub-committee, in answer to the first part of this query say No. Neither do we consider that a brother under the above conditions would be eligible to act as messenger to Yearly Meeting. Passed with its answer.

1918 ART. 2. Inasmuch as the ancient order of our fraternity always has been that members having a pending difficulty could not break the bread of communion until such difficulty was reconciled, is it wrong now for elders to commune while they are complicated in unreconciled difficulties, or to have charges or complaints against them? What is to be done with elders who do commune under above conditions? Answer: We your sub-committee unanimously agree on the first question that it is wrong. See Matt. 5:23, 24, also minutes of 1862, Art. 42 and 1917, Art. 1. On the second part as to what shall be done, we advise to continue the order of the brethren, for the local church and the adjoining elders. Passed.

1920 ART. 3. First, is it according to the Gospel and the order of the general brotherhood for an elder or for elders or any member to prefer a charge against another and then either of them commune or anoint or be sent as messengers before reconciliation is made. See Matt. 5:23, 24.

Second, can a brother that says we cannot have a communion in our district be a representative of the same as a messenger, and at the same time saying he will not commune not being satisfied with A. M.? Answer: To first part, No. To second part, likewise, No. Passed.

1922 ART. 3. (1st) We pray this A. M. of 1922 to give one order for preparing the communion bread.

As it now stands there are two ways of preparing it which does not look consistent according to the Gospel and the general order of our elders and forefathers.

(2nd) Inasmuch as it was admitted, that some elders and officials practice and maintain that it is right for brethren only to rule and pierce the communion bread, after the sisters have prepared it, while other elders and officials do practice and maintain that it matters not, and the sisters do prepare, rule and pierce it, said A. M. of 1921 failed to give advice, but laid it down, thereby indirectly sanctioning two orders.

Therefore, we pray A. M. of 1922 to advise all elders and officials that the sisters prepare the bread, and the brethren rule and pierce it. For the reason that through the woman Christ's body was prepared for the sacrifice; but the women never broke and pierced the Savior's body. For this reason the sisters have never been allowed to break the bread nor pass the cup to one another; and for the same reason we pray the A. M. of 1922 to advise all elders and officials that the sisters prepare the bread and the brethren rule and pierce it, thereby recognizing only one rule and practice. Answer: Concluded to grant the request of the above queries. See Mark 14:8. John 19:34. Passed.

1923 ART. 2. If the **ruling** and **piercing** of the communion bread is held as a religious rite and as **emblematic** of the breaking and piercing of Christ's body as Art. 8 of A. M. of 1922 sets it forth, then the bread of communion is being broken among us in private and by parties which is not in harmony with the Gospel of Christ. I Cor. 11:17 to the end of chapter. Therefore, inasmuch as the bread of communion, in its emblematic sense, can only be broken in a church capacity and at the proper time, we pray the annual meeting of 1923 to reconsider said article 8 of 1922 and advise that the preparation, ruling and piercing of the communion bread is simply part of the necessary and suitable preparation for a love-feast and that it matters not by whom it is prepared, whether by brethren or by sisters. Answer: We your sub-committee, agree to reconsider article 8 of A. M. of 1922, as we have no direct Scripture on preparing the communion bread. We consider it only common bread until it is blessed from a common to a commemorative use, when it becomes an emblem of Christ's body. Passed.

Complaints

1843 ART. 9. How it is considered, when in an important case a visit in the church is performed, and the case laid before the members, and some of them would give their opinion or judgment to the visiting brethren, but did not come themselves to the council-meeting, whether in that case the report of the visiting brethren may be considered as if the members themselves were present? Considered, in case of a judgment on a matter that has not yet been investigated by the church, in the same light as the question before. But in case of a testimony, where the members could not come personally, we would have to receive it through the visiting brethren as if the member himself were present.

1843 ART. 10. Whether a complaint against a member may be taken up in the church, that is of several years' standing? Considered, that this depends in a great measure upon circumstances. In complaints of a private nature, between brother and brother, the course which our Savior prescribes (Matt. xviii.) ought to be pursued; and when we have taken the two first steps toward a reconciliation, without being satisfied, then "tell it unto the church," is the Savior's command; and when the yearly visit has gone around, and the bread of communion hath been broken, and we neglected to obey this command, the church is not bound afterward to take up our complaint. But in case a fault has been committed by a member, and was not known to the complaining member until after a length of time, it is still his duty to tell it unto the church, and the complaint is to be taken up by the church.

1861 ART. 11. Shall members be allowed to go to the Lord's table and partake of the bread and the cup of the Lord, and when so done afterward bring up old complaints again, or, shall the church act upon such complaints or not? Considered, that when any matter has once been fairly investigated by the church, or settled between two parties, the decision should be final, and if a member should afterward revive it, they should be held responsible and fall into the dealings of the church, more especially after having partaken of the communion.

1861 ART. 12. Shall the church receive a complaint against a member before the offended brother go and tell his brother his fault between himself and him alone or not? Considered, that if we would read the rule of life as contained in Matt. xviii, we would find no need of originating such questions.

1910 ART. 2. In case a complaint or charge comes against a brother or sister, is it according to order to separate them from their companion in paying the visit, or shall the brother or sister be visited in the presence of their companion, there being no complaint or charge against the companion? Answer: We consider it not order to separate them, but they should be visited together. Passed by the meeting.

Confession (See Acknowledgment)

Conformity to World

1804 ART. 2. Further it has been unanimously concluded, that no brother or sister should be engaged, by or with a permit, to sell strong drink, wine, or ardent spirits, by the quart or larger quantity, because it is feared that disorder and harm will arise thereby. Therefore all members who are engaged therein should be earnestly and faithfully exhorted in love and long-suffering to abstain from it, in order that such example may not lead our youth and offspring into licentiousness and scandal. But if one or the other should not heed this counsel of love and admonition, and not hear the church, we could not look upon such act otherwise than as being disobedient according to an impartial judgment.

1817 ART. 2. Concerning conformity to the world in wearing fashionable clothing and everything that is high, without exception, it was considered, that when a member should herein be found guilty, he should be admonished; and if the admonition would not be heeded, we could not hold such in full fellowship, inasmuch the Savior says, "That which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." Luke xvi. 15.

1822 ART. 8. How it is considered, when members will not heed the counsel of love of the brethren, with regard to conforming to the world in clothing, etc. It was considered, for the third time in the great council, that when a member has been admonished in love once and again, we would not break bread with such. But at this meeting it has been considered, that when they will not receive counsel in love, we could not hold such member in full fellowship according to the gospel. Also such who permit those high fashions in their children who are yet under their control, and especially the bishops and ministers in the church should be examples of the flock.

1834 ART. 9. Concerning high and fashionable clothing, etc., and conformity to the world, it was considered a great evil as heretofore, which is not to be tolerated in the church.

1840 ART. 7. About the more and more increasing evil, that members conform so much to the world in building, house furniture, raiment, etc., and even to have a string of bells upon their horses at sleighing? Considered, that all the brethren and members, and especially teachers, ought to oppose and labor against this growing evil, and to avoid the tinkling of bells as improper for brethren.

1845 ART. 6. In regard to members conforming too much with the world in fashionable dressing, building and ornamenting houses in the style of those high in the world, it was considered that it is a dangerous and alarming evil, and ought not to be among the humble followers of the lowly Jesus.

1846 ART. 10. About pride, in its various forms, which is creeping into the church, it is thought highly necessary that the Yearly Meeting instruct and urge it upon all the overseers of the churches to see especially to that matter, and protest strongly against all manner of superfluity and vanity, such as building fine homes, and having paintings, carpetings, and costly furniture, etc., together with the adorning of the body too much after the fashion of the world. We believe that we should deny ourselves, and abstain from these things, especially the laborers in the Word, who are called to be ensamples of the flock.

1849 ART. 25 Whether it would not be agreeable to the gospel, to advise those members, who have been in the church two or three years, and are still conformed to this world, not to come to communion, until they deny themselves, and become transformed from the world, after being admonished thereto? Considered, that conforming to the world presents itself in such various ways, that we can not erect a standard in regard to it, so as to authorize the church to prohibit such members from partaking of the communion; but such members should be admonished and reproved by the church, again and again.

1859 ART. 24. Is it becoming for members of the church of Christ to get the walls of their houses flowered, or papered with flowered paper? Answer: We exhort all of our dear brethren to humility, for the apostle says (Rom. xii. 2), "Be not conformed to this world," etc. Humility is one of the prominent principles taught by our dear Redeemer, in precept and example. We ought, therefore, to try and abstain from superfluities.

1861 ART. 3. Inasmuch as the brethren have decided, in conference, that members who would not conform to the order in dress as generally practiced by the old brethren and sisters, that they could not have the privilege to the communion. But, as this does not restrain them into the order, we wish to know whether the church has the right to deal with them as offenders when they will not conform in dress or to wearing caps, and leave off wearing hoops? Considered, that such members should be admonished, and that warmly, too, to lay aside all superfluities and conform to the order.

1862 ART. 22. How is it considered for sisters to wear hoops, and to conform themselves to the new fashions of the world—shall we tolerate it or not? Answer: The answer to the third query of last Yearly Meeting is re-adopted.

1863 ART. 3. How are we to deal with sisters who are wearing hoops? They should be admonished once and again; and if they will not heed the admonitions, they should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii. (See Minutes of 1861, Art. 3.)

1864 ART. 7. When the apostles prohibit the wearing of gold and pearls (I. Tim. ii. 9; I Peter iii. 3), are gold watches to be included? Answer: As the carrying of gold watches may, and is likely to, lead to pride, we think it advisable not to wear them.

1864 ART. 8. How is it considered by the brethren in yearly council assembled, in relation to members who do not conform to the order of the brethren in the wearing of apparel, and in the wearing of their hair, but follow the fashions of the world? Answer: We think that the ministering brethren should heartily admonish and urge the members to conform to the order of the brethren, and set them a good example; and if those who are admonished again and again, and that by the church too, as well as by the ministers, will not hear, the word of God directs us what to do with them. (Matt. xviii.)

1864 ART. 10. Is it considered right, according to the gospel, for a minister to wear a soldier's overcoat when in the pulpit, or at other times; and, if it is not, how is such a brother to be dealt with, if he should continue to wear it after being admonished? Answer: It is considered not advisable for any brother, whether a minister or private member, to wear any military clothing, and if he is admonished, and still persists in being disobedient, he should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1876 ART. 11. We wish the Annual Meeting to say whether we shall have a rolling or standing collar on our coats. Answer: While we can not positively say which of the above forms of the coat should be worn, we would advise the brethren to try to become more uniform and plain, rather than to depart from the order of plainness, not only in our coats, but in every thing else.

1877 ART. 9. We petition Annual Meeting to reconsider Article 11, of 1876, and so amend its answer that it make the standing collar on the coat the old order as recognized by the brethren. Answer: This Annual Meeting reconsiders the above article, and grants the request.

1882 ART. 9. Inasmuch as the old order brethren are charged by their opposers of still tolerating among them things that are not gospel order, such as fashionable buildings, furniture, and costly array with tobacco-raising, etc.; and as it is said that they have never positively said that these things shall be put away, neither by declaration nor by practical demonstration, this district meeting asks that they at this Annual Meeting define and declare their intentions more fully, so as to harmonize with former minutes the old order brethren's Annual Meeting. Answer: This Annual Meeting decides that the things referred to shall be carried into practical life in harmony with the gospel which forbids conformity to the world.

1883 ART. 2. Inasmuch as we, the brethren and sisters of the Old German Baptist Church, have resolved that we strictly adhere to a plain and decent uniformity of dress, as soldiers of King Emanuel, would it not be well if this Annual Meeting would more particularly define the sisters' dress, in order that there may be more of a uniformity in giving shape to their garments? Say, for instance, bonnet straight, not rounded at the corners; neckerchief or cape large enough to cover the shoulders, and not rounded at the corners; apron not rounded; no lace, ruffles, or any superfluities on any of their garments. (See I. Timothy ii. 9; James i. 21.) In short, carry out the profession of non-conformity to the world in at least some degree of uniformity in giving shape to garments. Answer: This Annual Meeting grants the request named in the query. We think it is just as necessary for our beloved sisters to be in uniformity in shape of dress as the brethren. But this Annual Meeting recommends the handkerchief for fear that two orders may be obtained. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." (I. Corinthians i. 10.) "As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance." (I. Peter i. 14.)

1904 ART. 2. Is it right, according to the order of the church and the spirit of the Gospel for brethren to wear attached or standing collars to their shirts? Answer: We agree that it is not according to the order of the church or the spirit of the Gospel for brethren to wear them. (Rom. 12. 2.)

1909 ART. 2. Inasmuch as buying ready-made clothing is becoming to be a universal practice, even among our brethren, would it not be according to the Gospel and the order of the brethren to adopt the following plan: Let this Annual Meeting appoint a committee of three or five brethren to investigate some manufacturers of ready-made clothing and arrange to have brethren's clothes made in the order of the brethren for everyday wear as well as dress suits. Inasmuch as the claims are so often made that they cannot buy the every-day wear or work clothing in the order, causing some difficulty in the churches, especially in the West, to carry out the order in dress. Answer: We, your sub-committee, do not feel to recommend what this paper asks for; but we do see a great necessity for our members to adhere more closely to the order as laid down by the church, not only in Sunday clothing, but every-day clothing as well, and we do feel to advise our dear members that if they cannot buy clothing in the order, to make them at home rather than to break down the order of the church. Passed by the meeting.

Congregational

1863 ART. 20. Can an arm of the church (or a local church) be congregational or act independent from all the churches of our fraternity, and still be in full union with the church? It can not, according to the gospel and the order of the brethren. (See Romans xii. 4, 5; I. Cor. i. 10; Eph. iv. 3, 4,, etc.)

Covering of the Head for Sisters

1848 ART. 6. Whether the Scriptures require that women, praying or prophesying, should have any other covering than the hair, and whether it includes alike married and unmarried women? Considered, unanimously, that they all should have a covering on their heads.

1856 ART. 26. Would it be proper to reconsider the 6th query of 1848? Seeing it is admitted that sisters should wear a covering, what should that covering be, according to the gospel? We are satisfied, with our ancient brethren, that the plain cap, worn by our dear aged sisters, is a covering, as required by the scripture according to Paul.

1862 ART. 19. Inasmuch as it is the order of the brethren that sisters should wear caps, what should be done with a sister in case of stubbornness? And should there be any allowance made for the unmarried? Answer: We consider it is the duty of all the sisters to have on a plain covering at the time of worship.

1870 ART. 22. How do the brethren at this meeting consider it, if sisters are not willing to wear a covering on their heads at time of worship, according to the order of the brethren, and what is to be done with a minister that contends that there is no covering necessary but the hair? Answer: We are to deal with such sisters mildly, but strictly. But such a minister should be admonished to withdraw such contentions, and if he does not adhere, he is to be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

Deacons: Office and Duty

1835 ART. 15. What is the duty of a visiting brother? First, as visiting brethren and overseers of the poor in the church, they have to assist and attend to the yearly general visit from house to house; and it is necessary, and their duty, when the church is divided into different visit districts, to take the lead in the visit as well as that of the ministers; and in case the ministers could not assist on account of sickness, it is the duty of the deacons to carry out the visit with other brethren, and to bring before the minister and the church what they have found. Further, when any thing of importance is to be investigated in the church, the ministers have the right to request them (the deacons) to accompany them, or if the case is not of special importance, to send them (the deacons) to investigate the matter and bring it before the ministry. Further, it is their duty, inasmuch as they have been elected to be overseers of the poor, to visit the sick, especially if they are poor, who may be in distress by reason of sickness or other causes, to examine their case, and to report to the ministry, and, if necessary, the ministers to hold a council with the church what is further to be done. When money or grain is contributed in the church for the poor in the church, it is their duty to keep a regular book account of what they receive and what they lay out for the poor or otherwise for the church, so that they are able at times to render an account with and to the church. Upon the whole, all that may occur in the church and is to be investigated, is committed to their care, and if they hear of any thing, to bring it before the ministers, to counsel whether it is to be examined, and to see it done if found necessary.

Further, it is their calling to assist the ministers at meeting, by reading the Scriptures, by using freedom in prayer, and to bear testimony to what was spoken; and if it should happen that no minister (of the word) could come to meeting, it is their duty to lead the worship by singing, prayer, and reading the Scriptures, and if they feel so, to exhort to the edification of the congregation; yet it was the counsel of the old brethren that it is not their calling to rise on their feet in order to exhort; and thus to conclude the meeting in the usual order, and to make the ordinary appointments for meeting. Again, when a minister is called to hold meetings in another district, and he requests the visiting brethren to give him company and assistance, it is their duty to assist, and one or the other to go with him.

Further, it is their duty to serve at tables; when a love-feast is held, to make the necessary preparations, to call as many other brethren as they need to assist, and at the time of the love-feast to see to it that the sisters can get all things ready at the proper time, and themselves setting the tables, and so in all things see to it that everything is done decently and in order.

1839 ART. 6. With regard to the laying on of hands on deacons, it was concluded to leave it as heretofore. (See also yearly meetings, 1844, 1; 1845, 11; 1846, 3; Tenn. 6.)

1841 ART. 9. Whether a deacon (visiting brother) may give testimony to what a teacher has said while there is one or more teachers present that have not spoken, and request him to speak? Considered, that he may, if requested.

1843 ART. 1. Is it agreeable with the word of God for a deacon (visiting brother) to stand up in public meeting and exhort, when sufficient time has been spent already? Considered, that according to the word of God "all things should be done decently and in order;" and as teaching is the proper office of the teachers, and not of the deacons, they ought not to go any further than their calling requires of them, where it is not necessary, and it would not be advisable for a teacher to urge them (the deacons) any further than duty calls them.

1844 ART. 1. About the laying on of hands on deacons. This query has been before the Annual Meetings of 1838 and 1839, and the brethren generally considered, that since there is no direct command to do so in the New Testament, and on the contrary the apostle gives advice (I. Tim. v. 12), "Lay hands suddenly on no man," it would be best to proceed in this matter as the brethren of old have done. This is, however, laid down with this proviso, that if any brother could throw more light on the subject, it might be presented again to the next Annual Meeting.

1845 ART. 11. The question about the laying on of hands on deacons having been brought again before the Yearly Meeting, and being of such consequence and importance, it was considered, that since our churches are not generally represented —not one brother from Pennsylvania and Maryland, and also not many of our elder brethren, whose counsel had been given last year on this article, being present at this time—it would be best to refer this question to the next Annual Meeting, recommending the same to the consideration of all the churches.

1846 ART. 3. About the laying on of hands on deacons. On this much and long-agitated question, it was finally laid down as the safest way to continue as heretofore. The objection—that it was an apostolical order, which ought to be observed—was answered, that (supposing the apostles had laid their hands on the heads of the deacons, which in our apprehension can not be made evident), as little as a single walk of a few men through a wilderness will make a road or beaten track, just as little a thing once done makes it an order, and that if the example of the chosen seven (Acts vii.) having had hands laid on them, would have to be observed, as some of our beloved brethren understand it, then we would also have to imitate the example of the same church, which had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. Acts ii. 44, 45. But since we do not find in any other church established by the apostles any thing similar, and since there is also no testimony that the apostles ever after practiced the laying on of hands on the heads of the deacons, our beloved brethren will not think hard of us, if under these and other considerations, we abide by that practice with which so many faithful brethren in our churches have been introduced to the office of deacons and speakers of the Word.

1846 (Special) ART. 4. Whether a deacon can be ordained to the office of bishop? Considered, that we have no authority for so doing. (See I. Tim. iii. 10, and v. 22.)

1846 (Special) ART. 5. Whether a deacon should fill up appointments in the absence of the minister? Considered, that he may, by singing, praying, exhorting, and reading the Scriptures, but that he is not to preach until he is legally authorized by the church.

1846 (Special) ART. 6. Whether a deacon has a right to appoint meetings and preach without being authorized by the church? Considered, that he has no authority for so doing, but that he should try to discharge the duties incumbent upon him in the office for which he has been set apart.

1847 ART. 4. A request that the present Yearly Meeting reconsider the third query, as it stands on the minutes of the Yearly Meeting of 1846, concerning the laying on of hands on the deacons. It was almost unanimously concluded, that it would be better, for the present, to leave this subject rest as it is.

1847 ART. 5. Would it be considered expedient for a church to elect a brother for the office of deacon, whose wife is not a member? Considered, that if he be a brother of good report, and one in whom the church may have confidence, this circumstance ought not to hinder the church from electing him to the office of deacon, provided there be no other objections. I. Tim. iii. 12.

1848 ART. 16. About the laying on of hands on deacons, it was unanimously considered, to postpone the discussion of this subject indefinitely, until there is reason to hope that it may be done calmly, and without prejudice.

1850 ART. 27. About the laying on of hands, on deacons, when installed into office? Considered, that the brethren, after a long continued and attentive investigation of the Word of God, on this agitating subject in question, have come to the following conclusion:

Whereas, it is plain, from the acts and proceedings of the apostles, that there must have been deacons in those days, and that these deacons must have been active in their office, before the seven teachers or evangelists were chosen and installed into their office (See Acts ii. 45, and iv. 35): "Distribution was made unto every man, according as he had need"—from which we conclude, if distributions were made to every man, there must, of course, have been those that made them; hence, it is the opinion of the brethren, in this council assembled, that the seven chosen and set before the apostles (Acts vi. 6) were selected from among, as we might say, the first class of teachers (See Acts vi. 3, 8; viii. 6, 7, 36-38; xxi. 8), and hands laid on them by the apostles, to establish them, to settle the difficulty that had arisen among the deacons about the daily ministrations, and that the seven were not deacons in the restricted sense of the word, and were never called such—the word deacon never once occurring in the whole book of Acts* Therefore, the laying on of hands ought to be practiced on such old teachers that are set apart, and deacons ought to be received into their office by hand

---

*The word deacon (Greek *diakonos*) occurs about thirty times in the New Testament, and is rendered in the common English version twenty times minister, seven times servant, and only three times deacon. (See Matt. xx. 26, xxii. 13, xxiii. 11; Mark ix. 35, x. 43; John ii. 5, 9, xii. 26; Rom. xiii. 4 (twice), xv. 8, xvi. 1; I. Cor. iii. 5; II. Cor. iii. 6, vi. 4, xi. 15 (twice), and 23; Gal. ii. 17; Eph. iii. 7, vi. 21; Phil. i. 1; Col. i, 7, 23, 25, iv. 7; I. Thess. iii. 2; I. Tim. iii. 8, 12, iv. 6.

and kiss, as the practice has been hitherto with the brethren. The English version contains the word deacon twice more. (I. Tim. iii. 10, 13), but the Greek original has not the same word, and the German translation is more correct in these two instances, saying, literally (verse 10), "Then let them **serve,** being found faithful;" (verse 13), "For they that **serve** well, purchase to themselves a good degree," etc.

1858 ART. 16. Is it right for a brother, that is a deacon, to give out a hymn and sing it, ten or fifteen minutes before the time appointed for commencing meeting, when the house, or room, is full of people, or is it more advisable to remain silent till the time for commencing meeting arrives? Considered, that we see no impropriety in singing, when, in the estimation of the church, it is done to its own edification, and to the honor of God.

1858 ART. 35. How is it considered when ministering brethren have preached at meeting, and visiting brethren rise to their feet to bear testimony? Or, which is the proper order, for deacons to rise or keep their seats in exhorting? Considered, that it is not advisable, when two or three ministering brethren have preached, for deacons to rise and speak; but if there is but one speaker, or if there are none present, it is not inconsistent with the order of brethren for a deacon to rise and exhort.

1862 ART. 6. Would it not be expedient and consistent that the brethren forming the standing committee of the Annual Meeting of the brethren should open and examine all questions (sent in by several churches, and assort them), and thereby save an amount of unnecessary labor and time spent, as there are frequently two, three, and even more, queries of the same import and meaning sent in, and acted upon (separately reported hitherto by different committees) at the same conference, which, we think, could be avoided in a great measure? Considered, it is expedient.

1862 ART. 48. How is it considered if a visiting brother, at a meeting where there are five or six ordained brethren, hears something said which does not suit him, and, after two or three have spoken, arises up and explains the subject according to his own view? Answer: We consider it out of order for visiting brethren to rise and speak when ministering brethren are present, unless asked by them to do so.

1862 ART. 39. How is it considered when visiting brethren will, in meeting, get upon their feet and speak when there are elected speakers present, and sometimes speak thirty minutes or upward, and that without liberty from the speakers? If that is not in order for visiting brethren, what is the order? Is it to stand upon their feet when they have any thing to say, or to keep their seats? Answer: We consider it out of order for visiting brethren to do so, without liberty being given my ministering brethren, if such are present.

1863 ART. 13. When a member of the church is known to be in fault, the church sends the visiting brethren to the offending members, to invite them to the council-meeting; the visiting brethren, on their way, are apprised of another member having committed a fault; have they a right to invite this member, also, to the council-meeting, or must they first go back to the church to get authority for this second case? They have a right to visit and invite the member to council-meeting.

1867 ART. 12. Inasmuch as it seems to have been the practice of the apostles, in setting a member apart for any special duty in the church, to do so by prayer and laying on of hands, would it not be more in accordance with the gospel to establish visiting brethren and speakers in their offices by prayer and laying on of hands, according to Acts vi. 6, and xiii. 3? Answer: Inasmuch as it does not appear plainly to all the brethren that it was always the practice of the apostles to lay hands on those appointed to any special duty, we therefore think it best to make no change at present in the order of installing speakers and deacons in their offices.

1868 ART. 11. Inasmuch as in some of the churches, or districts, the visiting brethren (deacons) are permitted to rise up in meeting to exhort, and even to preach, while in other churches, or districts, they are taught not to rise, but to bear testimony to the truth and to exhort while sitting, and are not allowed to rise for that purpose. As the Yearly Meeting of 1835 has defined the duties in Art. 4, it is agreed to refer this subject to the Annual Council for reconsideration. Answer: We think it best to make no change from the present order.

1868 ART. 26. Can brethren, who do not possess the qualifications for deacons, required by the Apostle Paul to Timothy (I. Tim. iii.), hold that office? Answer: We think they can not.

1873 ART. 2. What Scripture shall we name as an answer to the following question: How shall those officers among us be installed, whose duty it is to serve tables and to attend to the wants and necessities of the poor members? Answer: Inasmuch as it is not certain that the seven persons on whom hands were laid (Acts vi. 6) are to perform the precise work that our visiting brethren are to do, and if they were not, then the manner of installation may differ, and the manner of installing our visiting brethren may be sought for in the general principles of the gospel, and not in any one passage, and so the answer of our brethren may be given.

1871 ART. 2. Inasmuch as the brethren, assembled in Annual Council in 1858, saw no inconsistency in deacons rising to their feet to exhort, and as some of the elders, when installing deacons, still charge them to keep their seat, would it be inconsistent, when thus charged, for them to rise to exhort? Answer: We think all deacons should have the privilege to rise when it becomes their duty to speak, and that elders, when installing deacons, should observe this decision.

1871 ART. 23. If a speaker's or visiting brother's wife dies, and he marries a woman that is not a member of the church, can he still officiate in his office? A scriptural decision is requested. Answer: We think he can; for where there is no law, there is no transgression.

1884 SEC. 38. Visiting Brethren not in their calling to rise upon their feet in order to exhort. We adopt as a general rule. See Article 15, 1835. (Accepted.)

1898 ART. 6. Inasmuch as there seems to be a little difference in the manner of the visiting brethren standing to read the chapter at the meetings, some stand facing the congregation, while others have their backs to the congregation, would it not be advisable to have one order in this as well as in other things? Answer: We agree and advise that the visiting brethren stand facing the congregation when reading to them, when convenient to do so.

1940 ART. 5. Is it consistent with the order of our Brotherhood for brethren to receive charges or complaints, while on the annual visit, and investigate such matters by visiting the accused without first reporting it to the official body and getting authority from that body to make the visit of investigation?

Answer: No. Passed.

Dealing With Members

1841 ART. 13. Whether a brother or member could be judged consistently with the gospel without having a hearing before the church, with the privilege to defend himself? Considered, that no brother ought to be brought before the council of the church for any accusation without having previous information thereof, and without having the privilege of being present at the hearing of the witnesses, and also of defending himself according to gospel.

1859 ART. 34. Is it according to the gospel for brethren, when giving admonition to the church after the annual visit has been made, to name members against whom something is alleged, in General Council, or shall we proceed with them according to the eighteenth chapter of Matthew? Answer: We ought to proceed according to the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, except in cases of open violation of the gospel.

1862 ART. 42. How is it considered if a brother has any grievance against another brother, so that he will say he will never break the bread of communion with that brother? But the offended brother does not pursue the course directed in Matt. xviii., but will go and break bread where the brother who has offended him is not present, and after some years tells this brother that he will never go to the communion with him. Is it right for members to do so, or, have members any right, after they go to communion, to say any thing afterward about difficulties which had existed before? Answer: We consider a brother has no right, under such circumstances, to commune until he shall have become reconciled to his brother.

1863 ART. 19. Is it consistent with the gospel and the order of the brethren for a brother who lays a complaint of bad conduct of another member before the church, to state the case himself, in the presence of the member complained of and the church, or shall the elders of the church state it for him, and thus conceal him? Let the manner of proceeding in such cases be left to the discretion of the church.

1865 ART. 47. How are the churches to hold and proceed with those members, who, in heart and soul, have been in sympathy with the rebellion, denouncing the government, and speaking evil of our rulers, especially of President Lincoln? As many members are unwilling to commune with such, a scriptural answer is required. Answer: We consider such brethren as transgressors of the Word, and admonish them to make satisfactory acknowledgment to the church; and if they refuse to do so, they should be dealt with according to the gospel. (See Acts xxiii. 5; Rom. xiii.; II Peter ii. 10; Titus iii. 1.)

1866 ART. 9. A member is charged with a crime, but before the case was investigated he removes to a distant country. Is it in accordance with the gospel for the church from which he moved to expel that member without first investigating the case, either when he is present, or by writing? Answer: We think that churches should be very careful not to expel members without giving them an opportunity of defending themselves; and, as a general rule, we consider it improper to do so; but there may be cases in which the church is justified in expelling members in their absence.

1866 ART. 36. What is the proper course for members to pursue when they hear a slanderous report against a member of the church, or even persons of the world? Answer: In all cases we should hear reports with great allowance, and when it is confirmed against a member, it should be brought before the church through the official body. As to persons of the world, we should, by no means, circulate slanderous reports of them, it being, in all cases, calculated to engender strife and confusion.

1873 ART. 4. Whereas, there is a difference of practice among the brethren, in proceeding with members who trespass in congregations in which they have not their membership, some trying the case in the congregation where the trespass was committed, while others would try it in the congregation where they live. Will not this meeting say where the offense shall be tried, and thereby establish a uniform practice in the brotherhood? Answer: The offender should be tried in the congragation in which the offense was committed.

1874 ART. 19. Will not this district meeting petition the Annual Meeting of 1874 to reconsider Art. 4, of the minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1873? Answer: Yes, and have the answer to read as follows: "A member should be tried in the church where his membership is, except where a member commits an offense in his church and changes his membership before it is settled; he shall then go back to the church he left and be tried there." Confirmed by the Annual Meeting upon a reconsideration of the query.

1875 ART. 30. A member, obtaining a letter of membership, moves into another church. Said church, knowing that said member had a certificate of membership, therefore fellowships said member for about one year. Said member willingly neglects to hand in his letter of membership to the church, and during his stay in the said church becomes disobedient, causing much trouble, and moving away in this condition, forfeits his word, disregards the advice and good counsel of the Annual Meeting, and the judgment of said church. Now, has the church from which said member moved last, got the proper authority to disown or disfellowship said member, if he continues disobedient or stubborn in not hearing said church? Answer: The church from which he obtained his letter should deal with him.

1878 ART. 6. Which is according to the word of God, to ask an accused member whether he is satisfied with the decicions of the church on his pending case, BEFORE they are made known to it, or AFTERWARDS? Answer: Afterwards.

Debates

1861 ART. 16. Is it proper or profitable for brethren to engage in public discussions with other professors upon religious or other subjects? Considered, that we think it right to defend the gospel, when interrogated (or assailed) either in private or public; but that we should not engage in worldly or political subjects, at least not to discuss them publicly.

1868 ART. 4. Is it considered expedient for brethren to join debating schools or lyceums? Answer: We think it not expedient for brethren to do so.

1875 ART. 26. Is it consistent with the gospel, and the order of the church, for the brethren to take part in the so-called lyceum, debating or declaiming society, or for ministering brethren to act as president, and thereby entice other members into the evil? Answer: We think it is unbecoming a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ to do so; and we would, therefore, most earnestly admonish our brethren to abstain from it. But should any of our brethren persist in taking part in such societies, they should be dealt with as other offenders, according to Matt. xviii. (See Rom. i. 29; I. Cor. xiii. 20; I. Tim. vi. 58; see, also, decisions of Annual Meetings.)

1877 ART. 20. Does the Annual Meeting **positively** prohibit members from attending any literary or debating societies? Answer: We would re-affirm the former decisions of our Annual Meeting, that our brethren should **not** attend the so called lyceums or such debating societies as indulge in theatrical performances for mere amusement, and which are contrary to gospel principles; but a literary society which only discusses the subjects of literature taught in our common school-books, and the sciences taught in our common schools and other moral and well-governed schools we will not prohibit.

Debts

1804 ART.4. About such brethren who so easily and heedlessly involve themselves in debts, and do not seek counsel, until they do not know any more how to counsel or help themselves; then they want at last counsel, when they desire and need help. It has unanimously been deemed good, that every church where such brethren live should endeavor diligently to instruct such brethren also in temporal or bodily things, that they should act considerately, and make no more debts than they can pay; and when at times their circumstances should be such that they could not see through, they should seek counsel of prudent brethren, and even the whole church is in duty bound to give counsel when requested; and if the counsel of the church should not be sufficient, it is also her duty to assist as far as possible in a case of necessity. At the same time such should be informed that if they would not receive good counsel they should not expect or hope that the church would feel bound or willing to assist much.

1822 ART. 4. Whether it is right for a brother to take the benefit of the law, was considered, that when a brother is so imprudent that he falls under the power of law, he is not to have privilege to take the benefit of the law, but to seek counsel from the church. Yet it would be always best to seek counsel before a member comes so far.

1825 ART. 5. Whether a brother minister that involves himself in debts, and assigns his property to his children, could serve in the ministry of the word, was considered, that when the creditors should be defrauded thereby, he should give himself over to the (judgment of the) church, and without doubt ought not to serve (in the office of a minister).

1825 ART. 2. Whether a brother may take a mortgage or judgment bond of another brother, was considered, that brethren should be as careful of the interest of their neighbor as of their own, and not be selfish; and inasmuch to take bail for large sums is deemed wrong, it is not improper to secure a debt by mortgage or judgment.

1832 ART. 5. How to do when a brother is indebted to another, and becomes insolvent? Answer. The church should deal with him acording to the circumstances or degrees of aggravation, according to the word.

Debts

1841 ART. 5. Whether a brother, consistently with the gospel, can take the benefit of the law for insolvent debtors? Considered, that there may be cases where the involving at first and the consequences thereupon are not at all compatible with the gospel, and where the church could not hold such as brethren; and that there may be cases where a brother, by misfortune, may be brought to such extremity, and if he were honest in his declaration, his application for the benefit of the law might even be excusable. In all such cases, however, the church has to investigate the matter, and judge accordingly, and if the church is at a loss, to call in, as in other cases, the assistance of elders from other churches.

1846 ART. 12. Whether it is agreeable with the gospel for a sister, who is the widow of a brother, whose property will not suffice to pay his debts, for herself to claim her full third of the estate, if the laws of the land allow her? Considered, that she has full power to keep what the laws allow her; but if there be poor creditors, and she, having a large dower, she ought to be as charitable as her circumstances will permit.

1858 ART. 49. A brother buys a farm that is sold by executors, who are not members of the church, and fails to make payment according to contract, the heirs being members of the church, who, after waiting a long time and being in great need of the money, and living over one hundred miles distant from the brother who bought the farm, receive a letter from him stating that he will pay them $500, if they will throw off the interest. The heirs, being unwilling to do so, send word to their executors to collect the money by law. Are the heirs now under obligation to pay the cost of collection? Considered, that they are not under such obligation.

1859 ART. 1. How is it considered if an elder gets in debt, and is sued, and is compelled to take the stay-law in order to get time to make arrangements to pay the claim, and pays it according to the time prescribed by law? Answer: We considered that he could do no better under such circumstances.

1859 ART. 13. Is it right for a member of the church to have his property set off, where the law allows a certain amount, say three hundred dollars? Answer: We think it is not right.

1860 ART. 3. What is to be done with the following case: A brother buys real estate, and becomes much involved in debt by borrowing money, and otherwise, and then, to secure some one or two of his creditors, mortgages all of his real estate to them. He afterward appoints a trustee to sell his property, which does not cover the liens against it, and the wife, who is a sister, takes from the trustee a portion of the personal property, in consideration of her relinquishing her potential right of dower, while much money will be lost by the creditors? Answer: If the church in which the case exists is satisfied that there was no intention to defraud, on the part of the brother, and that the sister, by taking the personal property, as stated, was an advantage, rather than a disadvantage, in the sale of the real estate, it may retain them as members under a satisfactory acknowledgment.

1861 ART. 4. How would it be considered where a brother and sister hold personal property and real estate, and the brother dies; has the sister a right to take the benefit of the law and hold three hundred dollars of the personal property and one-third of the real estate, and by so doing so injure the sale of the other two-thirds of the real estate that it will not sell for near its value, and will not pay more than one-half of the indebtedness of the estate, whereas, if she had left the whole of the land be sold together, it would have paid all the debts, and then left to her one-third of the money. Considered, that as it is impossible for all the circumstances to be known in such cases to an Annual Meeting, therefore such things ought to be settled by committees at home, selected by the parties and the church.

1862 ART. 30. What shall we do with brethren of whom the world complains to the church for neglecting to pay their debts, and for causing disappointments to their creditors? Answer: If the brethren can and will not pay their debts, they should be dealt with according to the gospel, as offending members.

1862 ART. 64. How it is considered if members owe a just debt, and suffer themselves to be sued? Has the church a right to bring such members before the church, and to investigate the case, to see whether such members have done their duty? Answer: We consider it has.

1869 ART. 5. How is it considered by the brethren, for a brother to take the benefit of the bankrupt law? Answer: Considered not according to gospel. Matt. v. 40; Luke xvi. 9, 10.

1867 ART. 6. Is it in accordance with the gospel for a brother to refuse paying his just debts, declaring his wife to be the lawful owner of all of his property? Answer: We consider it unjust for a brother to do so, and that such conduct should not be tolerated.

1879 ART. 13. Is it right and according to the gospel for brethren to avail themselves of the homestead law at the expense of their creditors, with a promise of satisfying them at some future time? Answer: We decide to refer this question back to the church from which it came, without an answer.

1871 ART. 21. Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting has decided that it is not improper to secure a debt by mortgage (See Minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1825, Art. 2), would it be proper for a brother to close such mortgage when the debt is not paid according to contract? Answer: We have no objection for brethren to secure money by mortgage, but we can not advise brethren to close a mortgage by a process of law.

Deeds: Changing Meaning of

1919 ART. 3. Has a local church or a committee of elders the right to change the meaning and effect of a bona fide deed for real estate?

Answer: No.

Defense in Law Suits

1882 ART. 8. From the Falling Spring congregation, Franklin County, Pennsylvania. A request of district meeting for advice in regard to making a defense in suit for church property. Is it right to do so? Unanimously decided to send this query to Yearly Meeting. Answer: This Yearly Meeting will find no fault with the Falling Spring Church for giving in their testimony in the case referred to, and if their just rights to their church property is taken from them by a course in law, we advise them to ask it not again, according to Matthew v. 40—"And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." (See also minutes of 1856, Article 12).

Defending Our Order

1862 ART. 18. The brethren assembled in council in the Valley of Virginia, being impressed with the importance of having the public more fully enlightened upon the ordinances, have agreed to adopt the plan at our communion meetings, when it is expedient, in the afternoon service, to occupy the time in discussing these subjects before the commencement of the evening exercises. Will the Annual Meeting approve of this plan, insert it on the minutes, and recommend it? Answer: While we strongly recommend the defense of the ordinances, we leave it to the discretion of the churches to decide the time and place of their defense.

Difference in Doctrine

1844 ART. 7. How is considered the difference in doctrine, that some teach faith before repentance, and others repentance before faith? This query had been before a council meeting, some years ago, and was answered thus: "Considered, that the difference arises when the word is not rightly divided. The apostle teacheth us that the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel from faith to faith. Rom. i. 17. And again, that he who cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. Heb. xi. 6. Out of this faith, when it is quickened, repentance will come; and when the repentant sinner hears and receives the blessed gospel, an evangelical and saving faith will issue therefrom, which worketh by love, and maketh itself known by keeping the commandments." To which the present brethren fully assented.

1855 ART. 9. What course is the church to pursue with members, and even speakers, who say they can not see, with the brethren, that the pardon of sin, and the reception of the Holy Spirit, follow baptism, believing and contending that many do experience the pardon of sin and receive the Holy Spirit before baptism, when such brethren have been admonished, again and again, that they should not contend for, or preach, such doctrine; but after all the admonitions and labor to convince them of their error from the Scriptures, which they will acknowledge, and then turn right about and contend for the same old thing, thereby wounding the feelings of the brethren, etc.? Considered, that we should bear with one another's private opinion in love, but ought to be united in word and sentiment as regards "the common salvation" (Jude iii.), and ought to speak the same thing; that is to say, the plain, simple, word of God, and earnestly and unitedly contend for the faith once delivered unto the saints, and that a doctrine contrary to the common plan of salvation should not be preached or contended for; but if done, and the brother is admonished according to the gospel, and he will not hear, we would have to proceed according to Matt. xviii. However, it was recommended to use all possible leniency, long-suffering, and forbearance in such a case.

Difficulties in Churches

1857 ART. 25. It is requested that the ninth article of the minutes of 1855 be again taken into consideration, because of great difficulties and dissatisfaction which have arisen from the same. It seems, according to that article, to be considered an error to teach remission of sins before baptism. This seems difficult and dark, and we desire a better explanation of the matter. If we receive no more light to satisfy our members, and even our teachers, we have fears of serious troubles in the brotherhood. Answer: We do not think that we can give more satisfaction than is given in the ninth article of the minutes of 1855, as the sentiments there expressed seem to be in accordance with the gospel, and we, therefore, adopt that answer.

1799 ART. 1. Whereas, there has existed for a long time a great difficulty between Bro. C. L. and Bro. J. Z., the overseers of ——— church; and whereas, there have been expressed very grave accusations and hard sayings by C. L. against some brethren, who shall be named hereafter, it has come to pass that Bro. C. L. has selected six brethren, and J. Z. has also selected six brethren, and they (both) have agreed to obey or submit to the advice or united counsel of those brethren, to which also the members (of the church) have consented. So we have assembled ourselves, we trust, in the fear of the Lord, and with a fervent prayer to God that he would bless our hearts with wisdom and understanding, in order to be enabled to counsel our dear brethren wisely, and to come to conclusions evangelical, or according to the doctrine of the gospel. And after having heard the complaints and accusations (of both sides), we have become entirely agreed, and believe all that Bro. L. has done grossly wrong against Bro. Z., and also against brethren A. M. and M. U.'s transactions, and against J. L. and J. St., and whatsoever else might have been done (of the same nature).

Further, we believe also that wrong has been committed by J. Z. against L., but not so grossly as Bro. L. has done. Hence it is our unanimous conclusion, that when C. L. believes in his heart and cordially makes acknowledgment before this present brotherly and member-meeting, and also before ——— (his own) meeting, and asks for pardon, and also makes heartfelt confession for the suspicious (and offensive) expressions against the old brethren, and against L. St., then we will, and it is hoped the members will, bear with him in patience, and he may continue to serve as overseer in W. church. And what concerns Z., we have agreed, than when he makes acknowledgment before the members that he has also done wrong, and asks pardon, he shall also serve as overseer with L., yet so that in important matters, such as baptism, breaking of bread, receiving and excluding (members), he should not go on without L's knowledge and consent; but with regard to holding meetings, attending funerals, and solemnizing marriages, he shall have equal liberty with Bro. L. Now, whoever of them will not submit to this above stated counsel and conclusion shall stand still in his office, until he is willing to accept it, and when it is accepted of both, there shall be hereafter no more heard of those things which are past.

Unanimously concluded by us, the subscribers: Martin Urner, Martin Gaby, Henry Danner, Peter Leibert, Jacob Danner, Philip Engler, Michael Pfoutz, Martin Garber Daniel Utz, Philip Levy, Valentine Pressel, Stephen Ulrich.

1803 Our cordial and united greeting of love to all our beloved brethren and members of the W ——— church. We wish much grace, mercy, and blessing from God, the Father of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, to all our fellow-members united with us in love and faith, as also especially to our dear brethren, C. L. and J. Z. It is our heart's desire that the good God would make us all faithful laborers in his vineyard; for all that were hired by that householder were hired to labor in his vineyard, to which we wish you all much grace, blessing, and salvation from God. The cause of our present writing is this: Since we, or some of us, have been informed by our dear brother, Martin Gaby, who, on his journey to us, passed through W———, and also had meeting there, that Bro. C. L., since the big meeting, has only been a few times at meeting, and now for a considerable time has not come any more at all to meeting, so that some brethren feel oppressed in their minds on account of the word or expression which is found in that conclusion made at that big meeting, viz.: "That Bro. J. Z. should not go on with baptism, breaking of bread, receiving and excluding, without L.'s knowledge and consent;" hereupon we, the undersigned brethren, have conversed on the matter, and are of one mind on it, and now the same as it was at that time (three years before), and is in part also expressed in said conclusion, though briefly, that we all considered that Bro. L. had done wrong grossly, and if he would believe it from the heart, and confess and make acknowledgment, we, and hopingly the members, would bear with him in patience, and then he should serve as overseer in W———, and thus should Bro. Z., in such important matters, not go on without his knowledge and consent. But if Bro. C. L. withdraws from the service, or from the duty of his office, contrary to the doctrine of the apostle, when he says, "If any one has an office, let him attend to same," (German translation, Rom. xii. 7), if, now, Bro. L. withdraws himself from the service of the church as overseer, so as not to attend the meetings, then he deprives himself of this honor, that Bro. Z. can not counsel with him, if he (Bro. L.) does not attend meetings according to his duty. So it is our unanimous mind, that on this account Bro. Z. should not be bound or hindered to go on in his office, and faithfully discharge its duties, and prove himself a faithful laborer. But if Bro. L. acknowledges according to said conclusion, and endeavors to be faithful in his office, then we desire and hope the members will receive him, and not lay obstacles in his way. We mean, on account of things that are past.

(Signed by most of those who signed the foregoing.)

1814 ART. 1. It has been publicly treated at the big meeting on Pipe Creek, about the lamentable disturbance and dissension which have arisen some time ago between Bro. C. H. and some members of this church with him, of one part, and the old ministers and bishop, and especially P. E. and other members, of the other part. This disturbance and dissension have existed already several years, and after said old brethren and ministers and overseers in said church had made many efforts with the church to settle the difficulty with the assistance of God, the troublesome affair has got worse still, so that said old brethren and overseers of said church had no other prospect but to counsel with other strange brethren, and have charged the beloved old brother, Henry Danner, to see to it, that the matter might be settled and put to rest.

Now the loving brother was concerned about it, according to his duty, and has, with other strange brethren, paid a visit to Pipe Creek, and had Bro. C. H. and his adherents invited to come to the council meeting. But Bro. C. H. objected; he could not come on account of his sore hand, and they came not. To the loving brother, Henry Danner, to whom as aforesaid was intrusted this important affair, it was a heavy burden; so he appointed another time, and requested old brethren from afar, and paid with them an other visit at Pipe Creek, especially to Bro. C. H. and some of his adherents, and invited them again to come to the (council) meeting. Bro. C. H. again would not consent to come, and they did not come again, with the objection that it was not yet time to settle the matter, and secondly, that they had not had sufficient information about the council meeting, and so they had not prepared their testimony. Then the dear brethren that had come from afar, counseled with the loving brother, Danner, that this case should not remain thus, while there were members suffering under it, and some even had to depart this life under this pressure and sorrow; under these considerations, and with the advice of some brethren (of the church probably), they appointed again another meeting some months hence, and at once wrote and signed a letter of information to Bro. C. H., and appointed some brethren to bring the letter to Bro. C. H., and to read the same to him.

When the appointed time of the meeting came near that strange brethren should have come, at least twelve, then Bro. C. H., before the time, went and made reconciliation and settlement with Bro. P. E., externally with hand and kiss before the church, so that many rejoiced over it, and the meeting and appointment for the strange brethren was recalled. But that settlement and peace, alas! did not last long, and Bro. C. H., with his adherents began again to complain against the church, and brought, not only new complaints against the church, but raised also again the dispute about the land here and there, and without counsel and investigation in the church of the new complaints, and without counsel of other older brethren and bishops, and entirely contrary to the word of God and to the order of our Chief Shepherd and Bishop of his church, and head of his members, caused a division, and tore himself with other members from the church and the members, whom he had brought into confusion and mistrust against the old brethren and church, with the hard and suspicious complaints which he and others, against the order of God, have scattered far and wide; while, with all the invitations when strange brethren came, they never came to this day, in order to prove them with sufficient testimony, as it is required by the Holy Scriptures, or God in his word.

He has now, with those members he led astray, formed a separate congregation, and broke bread with them; not at the proper time, inasmuch as we are not to keep the feast with the old leaven, neither with leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. Bro. C. H., with the others, have known that he was not in peace with the church, and especially with the housekeepers, nor they with him; and the Lord Jesus teaches us in these precious words, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Matt. v. 23, 24. Those whose eyes are anointed can clearly see that the whole thing is perverse. For the Spirit of God leads into all truth and union, and "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons (children) of God," and "by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if you have love one to another."

And not only this, but at said Supper he has introduced strange exercises, which our dear old brethren have not had, who indeed, as we believe, walked in the light, and in the pure knowledge of the truth kept house, and entered, as we hope, into blessed rest. And as some have heard, there has been drawn a shallow reason from Christ's words, to that practice, whereby that practice can not be established, and it is to be feared that said new practice is more calculated to cause disturbance, trouble, and division within, and rejoicing without among other denominations, as if the old Baptists and Brethren would have now to learn from them, that they had opened our eyes, and thus seeking persons who are yet in the twilight, may be confused, thinking the old brotherhood must have had the full light, else they would not begin new practices, and thus this would serve more to scatter than to gather, and more to the dishonor than to the honor of God.

Now, since this matter has thus worked from time to time, as has been briefly related, we, the undersigned, upon the request of said church, and more for the sake of God have found it our duty to take the case in consideration at this occasion, namely, in said big meeting; and several brethren have visited Brother C. H. and his wife, and others of his members, before the meeting, and have invited him to come with his company and bring his testimonies to prove his heavy complaints or accusations, in order that those members who might have committed a fault could be convinced, that there was hope, if they would, that all could be brought to rest and reconciliation. But he would not come to lay the case before the big meeting, and said there were too many judges at the big meeting—it would be better to have too few judges than too many. However, on the second day he came to the place of the meeting, and said if the matter was to be settled the land would have to be altogether measured, and they would bear the expenses.

But the council of the big meeting considered that with further deferring the case could not be improved, and slowly or never be brought to an end, and the measuring would scarcely contribute to that end. Yet they shall have perfect liberty to have the land surveyed, as it has been spoken about. And upon the whole of said case it has been mutually concluded by the whole council of the big meeting, inasmuch as Brother C. H. was never willing to come and bring sufficient testimony to prove said accusations, we will hear and accept the testimony of Brother P. E., and of all those who were accused, on their good conscience, in hope and trust as being true, until sufficient testimony should come, as the Scriptures require; and if sufficient testimony should come against one or the other, then shall he who is concerned submit to the council of the church, which Bro. P. and the accused have agreed to and promised before the big meeting. Upon this condition we declare the beloved brother, P. E., and the other accused, as absolved, and intend at this and other occasions to break the bread of communion in confidence and love with them, and to hold with them full fellowship, as the gospel of Jesus requires, and we wish them light, grace, and power from God to hasten forward on the way of Peace to the land of blessed rest. Amen.

Further, it was mutually concluded that the case, as above stated, is wrong, and contrary to God's order, according to the example and testimonies of the Old and New Testaments of the Lord. From these weighty causes, the big meeting concludes that impartial brethren should be selected, and they should give themselves up for God's sake, to pay the church a general visit from house to house, and before the meeting takes place to visit, also, Brother C. H., and all those who have cut off themselves with him, in a friendly manner, and to urge them to take steps toward peace, concord, and reconciliation with the church and with God, in as far as mistakes have been made, and all those who would thus come should be cordially forgiven by the whole church.

But if one or the other would **not** accept or receive counsel according to the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, and **not** abstain from their error, with such we could not break bread, and would have to deny to them the kiss and church council after a long-suffering and sufficient admonition; and if Brother C. H., with all his adherents, should oppose themselves, we would have to hold them, as the Lord Jesus says, "If he shall neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." The whole big meeting—yea, all members, should be engaged and prayerful, that God would meet us with his blessing and salvation. Amen. Signed, Samuel Garber, Benjamin Bowman, George Preiss, Daniel Stober, Nicholas Martin, Jacob Beshor, Samuel Arnold, Martin Garber, David Pfoutz, John Eby, Christian Long, John Schleifer, Daniel Long, Daniel Garber, Michael Etter, Henry Gibbel, Herman Blaser, George Petry, Daniel Arnold, David Albaugh, John Diel, Jacob Shenefelt, John Price, Isaac Long.

In the year 1814, November 17, the strange brethren have come again to us on Pipe Creek about the difficulties with C. H. and his adherents, and have visited and admonished them again to peace, and union, and acknowledgment; and with these lines we inform our dear members of Pipe Creek Church, briefly, how we found it on our visit to C. H. and the members that have turned away from the church. What concerns Brother C. H., the visiting brethren have proposed he or they should elect six brethren on their part, whom they would, and they should search out their true testimonies; and the old brethren on Pipe Creek should also elect six brethren, and prepare their testimonies, and then the difficulties should be settled, with the help of God, according to the testimonies.

Brother H. said he would have nothing to do with it, and that he would have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. This was the amount upon the whole, upon which we told him the conclusion made at the big meeting. Likewise we have told Brother J. W., upon his insolent and untrue asseverations, said conclusion. The said conclusion is, that if after patient admonition they would not return to union according to the truth of Jesus, we must deny to them, according to the gospel, the communion, in so far as not to break bread with them, and to refuse the kiss and council, until they should become repentant. We must observe here, that we have not seen any more of Bro. Benjamin Bowman and Nicholas Martin, after they had visited their part, and know not whether they have told the conclusion to any members. As concerning the other members who are with C. H., it was found different; yet several have declared that they would not fall away or separate from the old brethren, still they are halting at several points. We have told some, by heresay and suppositions, they had got off from the church thus far. Now, they should only believe what can be testified; in this way they might be restored and put right again. In this manner all the members should labor in this case with prayer and supplication to God, that by his cooperating grace all, and especially those who long after peace, could come again to peace and union with the church, according to the mind of the spirit of God and his soul-saving truth, in hope that they will reflect and choose that what is counseled them according to the gospel, viz: to strive after peace with the church. Thus we have told the other members we visited the conclusion only in this form, that those who would continue to adhere to C. H., and go on with him in his strange works, all such would be held as is expressed in the conclusion until they would return repentant; that is, all such who would continue to break bread with him and justify his strange baptism. Signed, etc.

1815 In the big meeting of the Brethren's church, which was held in White Oak church with Bro. Joseph Hershe, May 13, 1815, the following was discussed, and held counsel on the complaints arising in different parts of the church of the Brethren concerning the strange views of some members, which are deemed by us as erroneous and not founded on the Holy Scriptures, which Holy Scriptures indeed shall be the sole foundation of our faith. And since we live now in perilous times, in which arise many and manifold temptations, and also many errors, so that weak minds may be easily led astray and in confusion, not knowing what or how to do in order to salvation. And inasmuch now, at this time, among the many religious parties and denominations there are such whose doctrines on repentance, on baptism, and on the forgiveness of sins through the atoning sacrifice of Jesus, and on the sanctification through the Holy Spirit, seems to differ not much from those of the old brethren, only that they, according to our views, as the Word teaches us, do not put everything in the right place.

They require of a man, before he is to be baptized, that he should have passed entirely through repentance, and should have a lively experience of the forgiveness of sins, and that he should have obtained the new birth completely before baptism, so that they must confess such and be enabled to say how they came to it; and that only then they were fit to be received by baptism into the covenant of the grace of God. There should have been made even such expressions in public meeting, that a man must have obtained complete sanctification first, else he would be baptized too soon, as has been credibly testified. Now for such a confession or doctrine we see no foundation in Holy Writ, nor a single example in the whole New Testament. Candidates for baptism were directed to repent, or to a change of mind; they were exhorted by John to bring forth fruit meet for repentance—that is, to lead such a life as would be consistent with a change of mind; and of Christ and his apostles we do not find that any more was required of candidates than besides repentance, faith in the gospel—item, faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God. Hence we find no authority to ask more of candidates but what is founded in the word of God. We believe that baptism is the entrance into the new covenant, according to the Scriptures. We also believe that the foundation which was laid by Christ and the apostles is the only foundation on which we have to build, and that we have no right to change or amend any thing. We believe also that the (individual) cases of repentance are very different; that some have much greater difficulties to overcome than others; therefore we make (establish) no rule herein, because the Scripture does not give any.

And since we can not agree in the above-named points, with such who hold these points as articles of their faith, inasmuch as the word of God does not teach us thus, it happens sometimes that harsh expressions are made about the old brethren; for instance, "that they were a crowd of dead men, who had not yet come to a new life;" "unconverted, who knew nothing yet of conversion;" "a dead heap of flesh;" "as laying all in a heap in death;" that not one (of them) had come to a newness of life, or he could not remain among them; and on account of their baptizing too soon, the life of God commenced in them was presently again extinguished, so that they could not come to the (new) birth, etc.

Such expressions do not proceed from love, nor will they build love. We would let these good people willingly (to enjoy their sentiments) in peace, if they would also permit us to enjoy (ours) in peace. It does not work unto union according to the command of Christ. It causes schisms and divisions. It seems as if it was the object and purpose also in our churches, to fill weak members with their notions, and to cause confusion, so that many members become doubtful of their old brethren, since they are represented to them so cold and dead. And such we counsel and admonish, out of heartfelt love, that they should hold fast to the word of God, and not be carried about with every wind of doctrine. And it is our advice to all overseers and householders to admonish all the members to this, that they should take fast hold of the written word of the gospel; and if it should happen that some of our members should unite with such, break the bread of communion with them, receive them in their houses to hold meetings, so long as those stand in such separation against us, they (our members) should be admonished, and if they would give heed to it, we ought to have patience with them; but if they would not hear or be advised, they could not stand in full fellowship with us. For the Lord Jesus and the apostles teach us that we should be one, of one mind, speak the same thing, and that there should be no division among us; and to this end we also labor to be obedient to the gospel of Jesus by the grace of God.

1820 ART. 1. In the counsel of the assembled brethren at the big meeting in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, in Conestoga church, at Bro. Joseph Royer's, May 19, 1820, was proposed for consideration in church council the disturbances or troubles arising in the State of Ohio, in Mill Creek Church, by diverse doctrinal points which have been there introduced, viz.: it has been taught by Bro. A. M., who is a co-laborer in the word, that a man must have a real experience of the forgiveness of sins, and that he must be entirely born anew before he is baptized, which has been credibly testified. And it was considered at this meeting that there is no gospel evidence for such doctrine, and it was concluded with one accord and unanimity that if a brother will preach and persist in such doctrine, he could not be permitted to teach; for it is not consistent with the teaching of the apostle, when he says (Acts ii. 38), "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This is thus laid down until such brother will prove his or such doctrine on the ground of the word of God. It was also considered that Bro. J. K. went too far with the harsh expressions he made against Bro. A. M. in presence of the brethren, and it is required of him to make acknowledgment for such hard expressions, or else we could not be well with him.

N. B.—The expressions were these, that he is to have said, from the teachings of Bro. M., there was apparent a spirit of Methodism and of the River brethren, and an Antichrist, etc.

1820 ART. 2. A brother had used hard expressions against a brother in presence of the brethren, such as "from the preaching of Bro. M. there was apparent a spirit of the Methodist and River brethren and an Antichrist!" Considered, that the brother is to make proper acknowledgment for these harsh expressions, otherwise we would not be satisfied with him.

1835 ART. 2. Concerning the trouble between Bro. M. L. and the church, L. was earnestly admonished by the old brethren to amend his ways: not to creep into houses in order to bring members into confusion and cause division in the church, inasmuch as they (the old brethren) saw and understood what manner of spirit was in him. For if he should come so far as to speak in a traducing and railing spirit against the church, he would have to be put in avoidance.

1848 ART. 3. (Special) How it is considered when a part, say a minority, of a church disowns the other part, or a majority of the members, without taking a legal or scriptural course, and without giving a legal notice to the body of the church, and not showing or informing the disowned members wherein they transgressed?

1848 ART. 12. (Special) In regard to the third query, or the difficulties of Bachelor's Run Church with Bros. Oyman and Patton, and others, the brethren in general council considered that there had been committed errors on both sides, in consequence of which many members on both sides made satisfactory acknowledgments before the meeting, and it was concluded that with such, all that is past should be forgiven and forgotten, and with as many as may yet come and make satisfaction, and that they all should be received into full fellowship, and Bro. David Fisher in his office as a speaker. Furthermore, this meeting considers and counsels, that Bros. Oyman and Patton, and such others that hold yet with them, should have yet time to reflect, and should they come, also, in a reasonable space of time, and make satisfactory acknowledgment, then the church should also be willing to forgive them; but if they should persist in their contrary course, going on holding meetings in opposition to the church, and even becoming railers of the church, there would be no other way than to put them into full avoidance, according to I. Cor. v.

1849 ART. 20. Whether a laying off of the large church, here in the Glades, into several districts, would not be thought expedient? Considered, unanimously, that it seems to be necessary and expedient that this church should be laid off into four or five districts, and that a committee of elders should be appointed to visit this church, during the ensuing summer, and assist the brethren in laying off and organizing said districts, and at the same time, also, to visit Indian Creek Church, and settle the difficulties that may exist in both churches. The committee was finally nominated, as follows: Peter Long, Andrew Spanogle, and John Holsinger, of Pennsylvania; Joseph Arnold and Jacob Byser, of Virginia, and George Hoke and H. Kurtz, of Ohio.

1879 ART. 14. Is it right for a minority in a congregation to oppose the will of the majority in matters that have received the sanction of Annual Meeting? Answer: Not right.

1880 ART. 25. Is it according to the spirit of the gospel and order of the Brethren, when a committee is investigating difficulties in a church, for the committee to confine each party to three witnesses, especially to the accused, who were not informed of the charges to the investigation? Answer: Not right according to the spirit of the gospel and order of the Brethren.

1880 ART. 26. When difficulties in a church have been disposed of by a legal course of procedure, all implicated parties making satisfactory acknowledgments, and all the members present openly and audibly, one by one, expressing themselves satisfied, does Annual Meeting authorize committees (sent by that body) to hear and investigate such matters at the request of only a few of those members that expressed themselves, as above stated, and in opposition to the body of the church? And if so, what encouragement have churches to make every effort to settle their own difficulties, which has been the advice of Annual Meetings? Answer: Let the committee determine their duty according to the facts before them.

1880 ART. 28. Inasmuch as committees from Annual Meeting have caused great dissatisfaction in their proceedings with churches where they have made investigations, and for the preservation of the peace of the church, and the confidence in our Annual Meeting as well as the committees appointed by the same. And that we might have, as the Lord's people anciently had, but one measure and one weight for all. Also, do to others as we would have them do to us. In consequence of the above, we humbly pray and petition the district meeting and Annual Meeting of 1880 to grant the following: That when a committee is obtained, through Annual Meeting or otherwise, that a reasonable length of time prior to the investigation which is to be made by said committee, the **accusers** shall make known to the **accused** all the charges that are to be investigated, so the **accused** may be prepared to defend the case in the same degree of fairness that members generally have in offenses committed against the church. Answer: The district meeting asks Annual Meeting to grant the request. Annual Meeting grants the request.

1881 ART. 7. This Annual Meeting is asked to reconsider Article 26, of minutes of 1880 (Huntingdon copy), and if the present answer be adopted, to answer the following question: If members may bring up, and committees investigate, matters settled as set forth in said article, how shall congregations transact business so as to be final? or have congregations no such power? Answer: We decide not to reconsider the article referred to; and in regard to the second part of the query, we decide that an appeal may be made from a former decision of the church, if the committee sent urges it expedient to do so.

1885 ART. 4. Since Annual Meeting has laid down a safe rule for elders to observe in settling difficulties in their respective churches, namely, "When a church fails to arrive at peace and union they are to call in the adjoining elders to assist them to reconsider the matter of trouble," etc. Now, when the elder (or elders and other officials) refuse to do so, even when the dissatisfied promise to submit to the counsel of the adjoining elders, (they) agreeing with the church, what shall be done in such cases? Answer: Such elder (elders or officials) have failed to carry out the order, and investigation should be had, and such set in order by the adjoining elders.

Discipline of Children

1789 ART. 2. Inasmuch as many of our children and young people fall into a coarse life, and a great occasion of it seems to be a want that there is not sufficient diligence used in instructing the children according to the word of the Lord given by Moses in Deut. vi. 7, where we read: "And thou shalt teach them (these words which I command thee this day) diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up;" and also the apostle Paul says (Ephes. vi. 4), that parents should "bring them (their children) up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;" it is opinion (and advice) that there should be used more diligence to instruct our dear youth and children in the word of truth to their salvation, and that it is the special duty of the dear parents, as well as of the pastors and teachers, to be engaged herein, inasmuch as the apostle teaches, "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof." (I Pet. v. 2). And inasmuch as the children of the faithful belong to the flock of Christ, just as naturally as the lambs belong to the flock of sheep; and inasmuch as the word can be brought nearer to the hearts of children in a simple conversation or catechisation, or however it may be called, than otherwise in a long sermon, so that they apprehend the word of divine truth, believe in Jesus Christ, and accept his doctrine and commandments, and walk therein to their eternal salvation—hence we admonish in heartfelt and humble love all our in God much beloved fellow members, dear fathers and mothers of families, as also pastors and teachers, our in God much loved fellow laborers, in the dear and worthy name of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has given himself unto death for us, that we should die to ourselves, and live to him forever, that they would use all possible diligence that our dear youth might be provoked to love God, and to appreciate his word from their childhood. Do not spare any labor and toil to convince them by our teaching and by our life, not after the manner which is almost too common nowadays, where the young are made to learn something by heart, and then to rehearse it in a light, thoughtless manner, and then are permitted to go on in a life as thoughtless as before—but that they may give themselves up to God in an earnest life. The great Rewarder of all good will undoubtedly remunerate you; for those that have done right shall live forever, and the Lord is their reward, and the Most High provides for them; they will receive a glorious kingdom and a beautiful crown from the hand of the Lord. Sap. xvii. 17.

1831 ART. 1. Whether it was considered advisable for a member to have his son educated in a college? Considered not advisable, inasmuch as experience has taught that such very seldom will come back afterward to the humble ways of the Lord.

1857 ART. 10. How is it considered for brethren, and especially ministering brethren, to adorn their children with ear-rings, breast-pins, finger-rings, and jewelry in general, and send them from home to have them taught music, and to procure pianos for them. Answer: Brethren should not do so.

1862 ART. 34. Can this Annual Meeting allow brethren, and especially the bishops and ministering brethren to suffer their children, while under their control, to follow all the foolish fashions, such as wearing of hoops, and unnecessary ornaments of the body? Answer: We consider that such things should not be tolerated by the brethren while they can reasonably be prevented.

1888 ART. 2. Inasmuch as the ancient brethren in the year of 1804, Art. 9, do say: "Concerning the evil which grieves God and angels in heaven, and also the faithful souls on earth, namely, the new fashions which are in vogue in the world, and also here and there are believers who gratify too much the lust of the eye (Numbers xv. 39), and conforming therein themselves to the world; and especially our youth is corrupting itself herein so much that the Lord has almost cause to complain that all flesh has corrupt its way; therefore it has been unanimously deemed good that the bishops and ministers, as also all fathers and mothers of families, should use all diligence to counteract such things that they might spread no further, but rather be put out of the way." Therefore, we have sufficient reason to convince us that the evil alluded to is growing no less in these last days. Would it not be advisable and good, for the Yearly Meeting of 1888 to give the general brotherhood a form of dress for the members' children, so the members may unitedly counteract the aforesaid evil? And it appears that there is a uniformity of form required by the gospel, and by the order of the ancient brethren, in all things wherein it is practicable, let it be in children's dress, or in anything else that may be the cause of dispute, contention and division among the brethren. Answer: While we do not think it advisable to give a definite form of clothing for the members' children, this Yearly Meeting decides that all the members should clothe their children in a plain and becoming manner; no ornamenting with lace, ruffling, or bias pieces, or anything else to gratify "the lust of the eyes," etc.

(See Dress.)

District Meetings

1856 ART. 23. A proposal for forming districts of five, six, or more adjoining churches, for the purpose of meeting jointly at least once a year, settling difficulties, etc., and thus lessening the business of our general Yearly Meeting. We believe this plan to be a good one, if carried out in the fear of the Lord.

1862 ART. 58. Inasmuch as the brethren in Annual Council of 1856 have recommended the churches to hold district or council-meetings, and with this we have complied; now, we wish to know whether we should take minutes of our proceedings? Answer: We consider that no query of importance, acted on by the sub-district meeting, should be confirmed until presented to the Annual Meeting for its sanction.

1863 ART. 23. Would it not be better for the church if this Yearly Meeting would adopt the district meetings, so that the different states may form their districts as they may see proper? Considered, to leave this matter as it stands on the minutes of 1856, Article 23.

1864 ART. 13. As the Annual Meeting has recommended the holding of district meetings, we wish to know from it whether it would be advisable to make a record of the proceedings of such district meetings? Answer: We would advise to keep no record of proceedings but what is to be submitted to the Annual Meeting.

1864 ART. 14. Does the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1862, Article 58, prohibit us from taking the minutes of the proceedings of our district meetings, for our own benefit? Answer: Yes, we consider that it does.

1864 ART. 31. Since the Yearly Meeting favors district meetings for the purpose of adjusting local difficulties, and to lessen the labor of the Yearly Meeting, would it not be advisable to form regular districts in each state, and close them with lines, that individual churches may know to what district they belong? And, if so, should not this Yearly Meeting appoint brethren in each state to form such districts in their respective states, and close them by making such lines? Answer: Yes, but we will leave the districting of the states to the churches in the respective states.

1865 ART. 36. Does this Annual Meeting consider the decisions of sectional councils, which are not brought to the Annual Meeting, the same as those decided by the Annual Meeting; and if they do, why not take minutes of them, so that satisfaction could be returned to their brethren, who were dissatisfied, by epistle or by word of mouth, as the apostles and elders did at Jerusalem, in the first council? Answer: We consider that all district councils should be careful not to undertake to pass resolutions or decisions concerning the general principles or practice of the whole fraternity, but refer them rather to the Annual Meeting, and confine themselves simply to the settlement of local matters.

1865 ART. 55. Can the brethren, assembled in our annual district church meetings, pass decisions contrary to the decisions of our Annual Conference, and compel the brethren to practice the same? No.

(See manner of holding A. M. 1866).

1868 ART. 25. Shall district-meetings be held openly before the world, or before the church only? Answer: We think it best to hold our district-meetings as private meetings, but not so much so as to exclude any persons friendly to the brethren.

1871 ART. 28. Would it not be better to dispense with the district-meetings entirely, and go back to the plan of 1848, for holding the Annual Meeting? Answer: We think it best not to make the change asked for.

1875 ART. 15. The church of Luney's Creek asks our district to petition the Annual Meeting to change the name of our district from that of the "Third District of Virginia," to that of the "District of West Virginia," so that the publication of our business may be understood without mistake. Answer: The petition was granted.

1875 ART. 19. How is it considered for district-meetings to publish their proceedings, when the Annual Meeting, in 1866, has distinctly decided that it shall not be done? Answer: The districts should not publish their proceedings.

1883 SEC. 16. (Recon. Min.) District Meetings and Annual Meetings. Repudiate all decisions giving sanction for district meetings (see resolutions) for holding Annual Meetings. We retain the decision of 1848, Art. 29, with the amendment of Annual Meeting of 1882, Art. 2. All others void.

Disturbance at A. M.

1912 ART. 2. Inasmuch as there was much confusion caused and many feelings hurt at our last Yearly Meeting (1911) by a brother entering the dining tent and announcing that there could be a special car obtained to leave that evening if one hundred passengers could be secured. To get the number it would require some of the table servants to go, which some did, leaving their tables unattended, thus imposing a double labor upon those remaining faithful to that they had been appointed. Also ordering dinner for those that would desire to go away at a time about two hours earlier without considering those brethren that had charge of the dining tent on that day, who had ordered the general meal for all at 4 o'clock p. m. Also causing disorder by many coming in, sitting down, eating, and going out without a blessing pronounced or thanks offered, which required special effort on the part of those in charge to restore order. Will not the Yearly Meeting of 1912 devise some plan to restrict brethren so that such confusion will not occur again and that servants and waiters be required to find substitutes before absenting themselves before their labors are complete? Answer: We, your subcommittee, advise that the brethren bear one with another in this matter and be more careful hereafter in announcing railroad arrangements so as to make no disturbance, and also waiters not to leave without a substitute in their place. Passed by the meeting.

Divorce. (See Adultery Where Many Councils Refer to This Matter)

1860 ART. 10. A brother has a wife, who is not a member of the church, and she refuses to live with him peaceably; and having been living apart from him for more than two years, the brethren acquainted with the circumstances believing the wife to be the cause of the trouble, she now demands a divorce. Now, brethren, we would be very glad if you will give us advice in this case. Answer: We think a brother can not grant or accept of a divorce for any cause but that of fornication. "But I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery." Matt. v. 32; I. Cor. vii. 15.

1866 ART. 16. What shall be done in case a husband will not live with his wife, and she obtains a divorce, and marries another, and after living with him for several years, she desires admission to the church, and is received; but some object to her reception, saying they can not fellowship with her; can she be retained as a member? And, if so, what shall be done with those who refuse to fellowship her? Answer: We think, under existing circumstances, she can not be retained as a member. (See Minutes of 1850, Art. 12.)

1873 ART. 25. Is it right for the brethren to solemnize marriages in cases where parties are divorced and second parties yet living? Answer: No.

1877 ART. 18. We petition the Annual Meeting, through the district meeting, to reconsider the divorce question. For instance: A woman takes up with a young man, and leaves her husband and three children; then she was disowned. After some years she gets a divorce, and the husband married another woman. Can he now be retained as a member of the church? Both were members of the church before the wife left her husband. Is he now living in adultery, or are the innocent free or clear, according to the Savior's words, "Except it be for fornication?" (Matt. xix. 9.) Answer: We defer this question

1878 ART. 2. What is known as the "Divorce Question" was called called up as a deferred question. And the following request was presented from a district meeting. "We ask Annual Meeting, through the district meeting, to take up the deferred question of Article 18, of Annual Meeting of 1877, and pass it so as to allow innocent party membership in the church." The subject was again deferred.

1880 ART. 6. We ask Annual Meeting, through district meeting, to explain what is meant by the phrase, "In particular cases," in the minutes of Annual Meeting of 1877, Article 18. Answer: "Particular cases" means when the brethren see any cause for so doing.

1880 ART. 22. A sister departs from her unbelieving husband and procures a bill of divorce on the ground of cruel treatment; can she retain her membership in the church, while holding in her possession the bill of divorce, providing she remains unmarried? Answer: Yes, she can.

1881 ART. 8. The Maquoketa Church asks Annual Meeting, through the Middle District of Iowa, how to proceed with a woman that was deceived by a man, and afterwards, to get rid of her and the law, he married her by compulsion, but never lived with her. She some time afterwards made application and was received into the church, and has lived a very consistent life since, but finally made application for a divorce, and married another man. Under these circumstances can she be held as a member? Remember, they never lived together as man and wife after marriage. Answer: If such can not decide for herself according to minutes of 1868 and 1880, let her seek the aid of adjoining elders.

1895 ART. 1. Inasmuch as Article 22, minutes of 1880, with its answer, is by many considered unscriptural, and it is to be feared that the marriage vow is by many too lightly regarded, will this Yearly Meeting reconsider said query with its answer and say, that when difficulties exist between husband and wife, they shall proceed as decided by Yearly Meeting of 1858, article 10, page 211, and any party that would procure and hold a bill of divorce against his or her companion, could not be held in fellowship. See Matt. 19. 3-8; Mark 10. 2-9; and Eph. 5. 28-31. Answer: This Yearly Meeting decides to reconsider the query of 1880, article 22, and also decides to re-adopt the minutes of 1858, article 10, and article 14 of 1870; and we advise that members should by no means use the law to procure a bill of divorce, according to Matthew 19, 6-8.

1898 ART. 4. Will this Yearly Meeting reconsider the minute of 1797, page 25, article 5, and give us a more definite answer, inasmuch as the present answer does not harmonize with the rest of the decisions of our Yearly Meetings on this subject? We desire a direct and plain answer, so as to cut off all occasions for misunderstanding on this important subject. Answer: Yes, we are willing to reconsider said minute and answer, that we can not receive into fellowship any person while he or she has more than one campanion living. (See 1 Cor. 7. 39; Rom. 7. 2, 3; Matt. 5. 32.)

Doctrines: Strange and Erroneous

1785 ART. 1. Our cordial and united wish and greeting of love and peace to the beloved members, brethren and sisters on South Branch, especially to the loving brethren, Valentine Power and Martin Power, and all the members in your vicinity. We wish you all much grace and peace from God the Father, through Jesus Christ His dear Son, to be faithful to him from the bottom of the heart, according to the guidance and direction of His holy and good Spirit, even unto a blessed and God-pleasing end. Amen. Inasmuch as we have in part seen, and also heard, that there has arisen some difference in several doctrines among some brethren of your church and others, and having also seen the letter of the loving brother, Valentine Power, which he has written to the big meeting, and heard from it his views about "carrying on war," which are to be proved especially from the words of Peter (I. Peter ii. 13, 14,) so we have considered and weighed the matter in union, and we trust in the fear of the Lord but yet, for the sake of the word of God, we could not agree with such view, because we do not see it so, and do not understand so the loving Peter in that self-same chapter, nor in his other discourses; but God grant that we may be directed according to his good pleasure.

First, we do not understand at all, from the words of Peter alluded to, that we can give ourselves up to do violence, or that we should submit to the higher powers in such a manner as to make ourselves their instruments to shed men's blood, however it might be done. It is indeed difficult to believe that Peter, what he teaches in one place should have rejected in another place; therefore we can not understand him thus, but that his mind and admonition to "submit to every ordinance of man," etc., is something different. The question arises, How far or wherein are we to submit ourselves? and this question the loving Peter may answer himself. We find Acts v. 28) that the higher power to which Peter and John were subjects had commanded them straitly (in our German version, earnestly) that they should not teach in this name (the name of Jesus) any more, but they (the apostles) did not obey herein. And when they were asked again, "Did we not straitly command you," etc., then Peter and the apostles answered and said, "We ought to obey God rather than men." It will be well, when we attend always to the sense of Holy Writ strictly; and in the very same chapter of Peter alluded to, we see clearly that Peter exhorts for conscience toward God to endure grief and to suffer wrongfully, and says even that Christ became in this our example, that we should follow His steps. Now, we see that Christ always, in all His sufferings, endured them, and that with great patience, and never resisted or defended Himself; but, as Peter says, "He committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously." We see further that our loving Savior, though innocent, was attacked in a murderous manner by just such men as Brother P. has mentioned in his letter; but the Savior stood fast in the covenant of faithfulness as the brother stated. In a murderous manner he was attacked, and Peter was quick and ready to draw his sword according to the legal justice of God, and struck a servant, and smote off his ear. But what says the Savior: "Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Here, indeed, was the greatest necessity (for self-defense), but all this time the Savior resisted not; but He suffered patiently, and even healed the one whose ear was smote off, acting as it is written. "The righteous shall live by faith;" and again: "I believe, therefore I speak," etc. Thus our Savior had said before, "That ye resist not evil;" for so He believed, and thus He spake, and thus He did.

Further says the loving Savior, "He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture has said," etc. Now we will consider a little what already at that time the Scripture was teaching about Christ and His kingdom; so we see that the holy man of God, Isaiah, says of the time of Christ: "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Isa. ii. 4. Again says Isaiah (ix. 5, German version): "All war, with confused noise and garments rolled in blood, shall be burnt with fire," etc. So we believe where that fire which Christ came to kindle, where that fire burns, there will be burnt all war, as predicted; for the love to God constrains to the obedience of his commandments, as John teaches, and as Christ requires and says, "If ye love me, keep my commandments:" and his commandments aim throughout at nonresistance.

So we hope the dear brethren will not take it amiss when we, from all these passages of Scripture, and especially from the words of Peter, can not see or find any liberty to use any (carnal) sword, but only the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, by which we cast down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ, as Paul (II. Cor. x 5) says.

But that the higher powers bear the sword of justice, punishing the evil and protecting the good, in this we acknowledge them from the heart as the ministers of God. But the sword belongeth to the kingdom of the world, and Christ says to his disciples: "I have chosen you from the world," etc. Thus we understand the beloved Peter, that we are to submit ourselves in all things that are not contrary to the will or command of God, and no further.

And as to the **swearing of oaths,** we believe the word of Christ, that in all things which we are to testify, we shall testify what is yea, or what is true with yea, and what is nay, or not true with nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. And herewith we will conclude for this. This we intended to send you in writing with our dear brethren Daniel Leatherman, and Jacob Danner, and Henry Danner.

Written May 15, 1785, at the big meeting on Big Conewago, from your brethren, united in love, Jacob Saur, Valentine Pressel, Mich. Bosserman, Martin Reinhart, David Studebaker, Peter Dierdorf, Martin Urner, Jacob Stoll, Christian Longenecker, Henry Neff, Lorenz Beckner, Philip Lewig.

1790 ART. 1. Unanimously concluded, that we desire and pray that the beloved brother, Valentine P., would desist from his strange notion, because he has renounced with us before God, angels, and men, all things that are contrary to the wholesome doctrine, and we believe and confess that Christ has forbidden to his followers the swearing of oaths and partaking of war. Hence we must keep to His word and truth, and withdraw ourselves from every brother that returns again to swearing and war. It is imposible for us to break the bread of communion with such a brother, who pretends the higher powers were requiring such of him. For they can not compel us, if they would, because we are to obey God rather than men. But now, thanks to God, we have such a government that will not require of us what is against our conscience. But should there be any among us having such a conscience as to be able to fight and swear oaths; such a one would not be of us; neither would we break the bread of communion with a minister that would baptize backward, contrary to our faith.

1794 ART. 2. We hear that there arises a strange doctrine, or rather opinion, among the brethren in Carolina, and that some brethren are grieved about this matter, because some believe, say, and teach the following, viz.:

1. There is no other heaven but that in man.

2. That there is no other hell but that in man.

3. That God has no form or shape; and if a person would worship God, and would conceive in his mind God as in the human form; would imagine or believe that God had an appearance like a man, such a person would do the same as one who would worship a horse or any other beast.

4. That God had no anger, and would punish no person on account of his sins.

5. That the dead rise not; for out of the grave nothing would come forth.

6. That they will have nothing to do with the ban (or excommunication).

For this cause some brethren desire to hear the views or minds of the brethren (in general council), and therefore we inform the loving brethren, that the view or doctrine of the old brethren is, that we are to believe as **the Scripture has said.** For Christ says, "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture has said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." John vii. 38. Further he says, "The Scriptures can not be broken." John x. 35. Again, we see that Christ in His whole life has looked upon the Scriptures, and has fulfilled them in all things. For when they came, and Peter struck with the sword, the Lord said, "Put up again thy sword into his place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Thinkest thou that I can not now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" **But how then shall the Scripture be fulfilled, that thus it must** be?" Matt. xxvi. 50-54.

Now, to come to the before-mentioned points or propositions, our dear brethren will not think hard of us because we believe as it is written, and believe also with David, that the word of the Lord is well defined, and a true doctrine, and that we also believe with Paul, that it is our duty to bring into captivity every thought (all reason, says the German) to the obedience of Christ, etc.

1. Now, to come to the word about **heaven.** Says Moses (Gen. i. 1), "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; and the earth was without form, and void." Then no man was created yet, and Moses calls something **heaven,** that is not in man. And (Acts i. 9) if we read, "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven." Here we see that there is a **heaven** up on high.

2. "That there be no other hell but that in man." We read (Luke xv. 22, ff) about the rich man, that he died and that he also was buried. Now, it is without contradiction that when he died his soul and spirit had departed from the body, and had found, it seems, according to the word, the hell in which he suffered torments. So we think it would be well for us, if we would on this point or word "hell" apply the doctrine of Paul, not to dispute about words; for we can notice in Holy Writ that the word hell is used for different things. But we believe, as it is written, that there is a lake of fire or place of torment, in many places mentioned, which, according to the word, is outside of men, as we read plainly (Matt. xxv. 41) where Christ says, "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Here we see clearly that the lake of fire is not in man, because men are sent into the lake of fire, and it says not that the fire should go into the men.

3. "That God has no shape or form; and if a person would worship God, and would conceive in his mind and believe God having a form like a man, such person would do the same as if he worshiped a horse or any other beast." This, it seems to us, is speaking very derogatory of God, or against God, though we believe, also, from the heart that God is a Spirit, as Christ Himself says, and that the true worshipers worship Him in spirit and in truth. But not at all contrary to this says John, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." And further on, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us, and we beheld His glory," etc. Here God has put on a visible form. Now, to be sure, in his worship man should not imagine a form or likeness of God; but if it should happen that a person or disciple would, in his

worship in simplicity and sincerity toward God, look to God in the person or appearance of Christ, we consider it far less culpable than for a man to worship a horse or some other beast, and deem this a very unbecoming expression.

4. That God has no anger, and punishes no person for his sins." Now, we believe also with John, "that God is love; and that he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him;" and that God is not angry like an unconverted man, but that penal judgments proceed from love to the human family. Yet notwithstanding the holy Scriptures or the men of God in Holy Writ call God's judgment God's wrath, as Psalm xc. 11, "Who knoweth the power of thine anger? Even according to thy fear, so is thy wrath." Again, John the Baptist says (John iii. 36), "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, **but the wrath of God abideth on him."** And that the Lord would punish no man for his sin, we deem to be an error. Christ says Himself, "Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered such things? I tell you, nay, but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Luke xiii. 2, 3.

5. "That the dead rise not, for out of the grave nothing would come forth." We believe, as Christ says (John v. 28), "The hour is coming, in the which **all that are in the graves** shall hear His voice, and shall come forth," etc. So we read (Matt. xxvii. 51, 52), "The earth did quake, and the rocks rent, and the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves," etc.

1798 ART. 1. It has been made known to us that last fall, at the great council meeting of the brethren in Virginia, there was some discussion on account of the different views of the brethren, especially those in Carolina, where a brother minister, by name of John H., has defended himself in the name of his whole church before many brethren in public, and brought to light many of his own sentiments, in so far that the brethren who still hold fast to the word of truth, according to their best knowledge, could not break the bread of communion with said John H.; would, however, in such serious circumstances, not lightly make a full conclusion without hearing first, also, the mind of their beloved old, and by many temptations, established brethren; hence this is to inform our dear brethren in North Carolina that the case has been presented to the brethren by those brethren who have seen John H. himself, and have heard any objections whatever are urged against him. He shall go to from him many of his what can scarcely be called doctrines, but rather perverse apprehensions of Holy Writ, and have quite unanimously concluded that we can not hold said John H., and all who are of his mind, as brethren as long as they do not acknowledge the doctrine of Jesus and his apostles as a true doctrine sent from God unto salvation, and publicly confess, according to which doctrine we are to prove all the spirits and powers operating in us, and necessarily must; for we believe and confess, with David, that the word of the Lord is a true doctrine and well refined; therefore we can not acknowledge such as our brethren any more while they contradict the Holy Scriptures in many points. This we, the undersigned brethren, confess and testify to hold them as other people out of the church as long as they do not seek and keep house according to the Scripture.

Signed by the brethren.

P. S.—**(COPY.) This is to certify** that I heard John H. say in his preaching that it would be no more sin to him to get upon the top of the barn that he was in, and preaching in, and swear and blaspheme all the new-found oaths and curses, than to pray to God to forgive him his sins, or to bless him in any respect; and he said he had not served such a God that required the prayers of human creatures to forgive them their sins, or to bless them in any manner, these seven years, nor never would. These are the words I heard, as near as I can remember.

Per me, Samuel Van Etten,
Johannes Keller.

1800 ART. 1. (On account of brethren in Carolina.) It has been made known to us that the brethren in Carolina desire to be informed more plainly concerning the conclusion made at the big meeting on Little Conewago, May 26, 1798, where it was concluded in union about Brother John H., and all who are of his mind, that we could have no fellowship with him (and them) as long as they persisted in their erroneous doctrine contrary to Holy Scripture. And since it is requested to inform them why and for what cause it was done, we should specify by name the causes for which we can have no more fellowship with John H. and his sympathizers—this is to further inform them that the chief causes were already mentioned in a letter from the big meeting held on Shenandoah, Virginia, October 20, 1794, as follows, viz: that there arises a strange doctrine, or rather opinion, among the brethren in Carolina, and that other brethren are grieved by the same. (The six points are given in Minutes of 1794.) These six chief points have been specified in the above-mentioned letter of the big meeting, with the answer, as the old brethren have given their views and doctrine in refutation, which letter, as we presume, has been sent to the brethren in Carolina, and they are all desired to read the same at pleasure. Then again, at the big meeting which was held on Little Conewago, May 26, 1798, the same case was once more viewed by the old brethren, and also the Germantown brethren have sent their opinion by letter from Brother Sander Mack, wherein it is sorrowfully lamented that among the little flock of the Taufs-Gesinute in America there should arise men who deny the resurrection of the dead, and that among brothers and sisters some had to have the misfortune to have their eyes smeared by that old, moldy, and horribly stinking leaven of the Sadducees. And in addition a written testimony has come to hand about John H., that he should have said in his preaching, which two truthful men have heard him say it, and have testified to it. (See postscript, Minutes of 1798.)

Behold, much beloved brethren, in view of all the unscriptural doctrines and expressions, we have been moved (compelled) to exclude from the fellowship and membership of the Lord Jesus at the big meeting of May 26th, said John H., and all that are in union with him in such views, and we confirm again that conclusion unanimously in our great meeting of the brethren today, renouncing all fellowship with each and all such persons as hold such doctrines and views as are stated above, until they acknowledge their error and repent. Still, we look upon this case with sadness and heartfelt grief, and wish them (grace) of God in Christ Jesus, whose mercy endureth forever, that they may earnestly reflect and consider what may make for their peace and everlasting salvation while yet it is the accepted time and the day of salvation. This we desire from the bottom of our hearts, that the good God, through the tender mercy of Jesus Christ, would give and bestow to them and us for his merciful love's sake. Amen. So much from us, the undersigned brethren, assembled with one accord, and delivered to the hands of our loving brethren, who also, in words, will make it known to you in the name of the whole fraternity.

1815 In the big meeting of the Brethren's church, which was held in White Oak church with Bro. Joseph Hershe, May 13, 1815, the following was discussed, and held counsel on the complaints arising in different parts of the church of the

Brethren concerning the strange views of some members, which are deemed by us as erroneous and not founded on the Holy Scriptures, which Holy Scriptures indeed shall be the sole foundation of our faith. And since we live now in perilous times, in which arise many and manifold temptations, and also many errors, so that weak minds may be easily led astray and in confusion, not knowing what or how to do in order to salvation. And inasmuch now, at this time, among the many religious parties and denominations there are such whose doctrines on repentance, on baptism, and on the forgiveness of sins through the atoning sacrifice of Jesus, and on the sanctification through the Holy Spirit, seem to differ not much from those of the old brethren, only that they, according to our views, as the Word teaches us, do not put every thing in the right place.

They require of a man, before he is to be baptized, that he should have passed entirely through repentance, and should have a lively experience of the forgiveness of sins, and that he should have obtained the new birth completely before baptism, so that they must confess such and be enabled to say how they came to it; and that only then they were fit to be received by baptism into the covenant of the grace of God. There should have been made even such expressions in public meeting, that a man must have obtained complete sanctification first, else he would be baptized too soon, as has been credibly testified. Now for such a confession or doctrine we see no foundation in Holy Writ, nor a single example in the whole New Testament. Candidates for baptism were directed to repent, or to a change of mind; they were exhorted by John to bring forth fruit meet for repentance—that is, to lead such a life as would be consistent with a change of mind; and of Christ and his apostles we do not find that any more was required of candidates than besides repentance, faith in the gospel—item, faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God. Hence we find no authority to ask more of candidates but what is founded in the word of God. We believe that baptism is the entrance into the new covenant, according to the Scriptures. We also believe that the foundation which was laid by Christ and the apostles is the only foundation on which we have to build, and that we have no right to change or amend any thing. We believe also that the (individual) cases of repentance are very different; that some have much greater difficulties to overcome than others; therefore we make (establish) no rule herein, because the Scripture does not give any.

And since we can not agree in the above-named points, with such who hold these points as articles of their faith, inasmuch as the word of God does not teach us thus, it happens sometimes that harsh expressions are made about the old brethren; for instance, "that they were a crowd of dead men, who had not yet come to a new life;" "unconverted, who knew nothing yet of conversion;" "a dead heap of flesh;" "as laying all in a heap of death;" that not one (of them) had come to a newness of life, or he could not remain among them; and on account of their baptizing too soon, the life of God commenced in them was presently again extinguished, so that they could not come to the (new) birth, etc.

Such expressions do not proceed from love, nor will they build love. We would let these good people willingly (to enjoy their sentiments) in peace, if they would also permit us to enjoy (ours) in peace. It does not work unto union according to the command of Christ. It causes schisms and divisions. It seems as if it was the object and purpose also in our churches, to fill weak members with their notions, and to cause confusion, so that many members become doubtful of their old brethren, since they are represented to them so cold and dead. And such we counsel and admonish, out of heartfelt love, that they should hold fast to the word of God, and not be carried about with every wind of doctrine. And it is our advice to all overseers and householders to admonish all the members to this, that they should take fast hold of the written word of the gospel; and if it should happen that some of our members should unite with such, break the bread of communion with them, receive them in their houses to hold meetings, so long as those stand in such separation against us, they (our members) should be admonished, and if they would give heed to it, we ought to have patience with them; but if they would not hear or be advised, they could not stand in full fellowship with us. For the Lord Jesus and the apostles teach us that we should be one, of one mind, speak the same thing, and that there should be no division among us; and to this end we also labor to be obedient to the gospel of Jesus by the grace of God.

1820 ART. 1. In the counsel of the assembled brethren at the big meeting in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, in Conestoga church, at Bro. Joseph Royer's, May 19, 1820, was proposed for consideration in church council the disturbances or troubles arising in the State of Ohio, in Mill Creek Church, by diverse doctrinal points which have been there introduced, viz.: it has been taught by Bro. A. M., who is a co-laborer in the word, that a man must have a real experience of the forgiveness of sins, and that he must be entirely born anew before he is baptized, which has been credibly testified. And it was considered at this meeting that there is no gospel evidence for such doctrine, and it was concluded with one accord and unanimity that if a brother will preach and persist in such doctrine, he could not be permitted to teach; for it is not consistent with the teaching of the apostle, when he says (Acts ii. 38), "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This is thus laid down until such brother will prove his or her doctrine on the ground of the word of God. It was also considered that Bro. J. K. went too far with the harsh expressions he made against Bro. A. M. in presence of the brethren, and it is required of him to make acknowledgment for such hard expressions, or else we could not be well with him.

N. B.—The expressions were these, that he is to have said, from the teachings of Bro. M., there was apparent a spirit of Methodism and of the River brethren, and an Anti-christ, etc.

ART. 2. A brother had used hard expressions against a brother in presence of the brethren, such as "from the preaching of Bro. M. there was apparent a spirit of the Methodist and River brethren and an Antichrist!" Considered, that the brother is to make proper acknowledgment for these harsh expressions, otherwise we would not be satisfied with him.

(See A. M. under Difficulties in Churches, 1815)

1847 ART. 6. How it is considered, if a brother preaches up the doctrine that Jesus Christ himself baptized, and contends so hard for it, that it has already caused a division in the church? Considered, that the brethren present, at this Yearly Meeting, unanimously believe that Jesus did not baptize, but his disciples, as recorded (John iv. 2), and they also admonish such a brother not to speak so any more; and if he should still persist in so doing, that he shall not do it in the name of the brethren.

1847 ART. 7. How is it considered, if a brother preach a sentiment, on a part of scripture, that would not be in accordance with the general views of the brethren (yet made good doctrine), whether it would be agreeable to the rules of the brethren, to make it a question at the general council-meeting, and forbid him to preach it, or condemn him for it, as erroneous, without first reasoning with him, or taking the counsel of the church wherein he lives? Considered, by the brethren present, that no accusation should be brought before the general council-meeting against a brother, in such a case, unless he first having had a hearing before his own church.

1849 ART. 24. How is it considered, when a brother, who is a deacon of the church, holds and defends the views of Romanists, and other sects? Considered, that such a brother should be visited by the brethren, and admonished; and if he still persists to hold and defend such views and practices, contrary to the views of the brethren, he could not be continued as a brother.

1853 ART. 15. How would the brethren hold a teacher that had preached that there was no such a being as a devil, and that there was no serpent that beguiled Eve in the garden of Eden; that it was only the lust that tempted her, and every one: but, after being admonished, promised not to teach or argue said doctrine, yet still harbors the same belief? Considered, that such teacher was admonished right, that he should not preach such doctrine; and if he should still persist in holding such sentiments, the brethren could not hold him as a teacher, or even as a member. He should be admonished to search the Scriptures, which are able to make him wise unto salvation.

1854 ART. 12. When a man who says he is very near the brethren, but yet finds fault with them, comes and wants to hold meetings among us, what shall we do with him and with such brethren who go with and encourage such? Considered, that we ought not to receive such as ministers, and brethren who encourage them should be admonished, as those who do not walk consistently with the gospel. "A house divided against itself can not stand."

1853 ART. 42. If a person makes application to be received into the church, and believes that the wicked will be totally burned up, can he be received with that faith or not? Considered, that persons should, in the first place, be taught the principles of the gospel, and then be baptized on his faith, showing forth fruits of repentance.

1855 ART. 9. What course is the church to pursue with members, and even speakers, who say they can not see, with the brethren, that the pardon of sin, and the reception of the Holy Spirit, follow baptism, believing and contending that many do experience the pardon of sin and receive the Holy Spirit before baptism, when such brethren have been admonished, again and again, that they should not contend for, or preach, such doctrine; but after all the admonitions and labor to convince them of their error from the Scriptures, which they will acknowledge, and then turn right about and contend for the same old thing, thereby wounding the feelings of the brethren, etc.? Considered, that we should bear with one another's private opinion in love, but ought to be united in word and sentiment as regards "the common salvation" (Jude iii.), and ought to speak the same thing; that is to say, the plain, simple, word of God, and earnestly and unitedly contend for the faith once delivered unto the sains, and that a doctrine contrary to the common plan of salvation should not be preached or contended for; but if done, and the brother is admonished according to the gospel, and he will not hear, we would have to proceed according to Matt. xviii. However, it was recommended to use all possible leniency, long-suffering, and forbearance in such a case.

1858 ART. 48. How is it considered when brethren preach and argue that there is no difference between the soul and the body, and hell and the grave, and that there is no knowledge between death and the resurrection, and no punishment after death, but that the wicked will be immediately destroyed or annihilated? Answer: Such brethren should be sharply reproved of their errors, and if they will not hear the church, we can not hold such as brethren, much less as preachers.

(See Art. 3, 1859)

1865 ART. 58. Whereas, it has been plainly proved to the brethren assembled at this Annual Meeting, that William C. Thurman did, on different occasions, say things publicly in his preaching against the practice of the brethren, and has done the same in his writings, and by the course he has pursued he has given offense to the brethren; it is, therefore, the decision of this meeting that we can not recognize him as a minister of the gospel among us until he gives satisfaction to the church.

1866 ART. 48. Bro. William C. Thurman appearing at the meeting, and giving satisfaction to the brethren, was restored to his office as minister. The following was submitted to him, and he accepted it by signing it: 'He shall consent to give and take counsel, and to teach and obey the gospel, omitting to mention, in preaching on the dostrine of feet-washing among the brethren, and everywhere else, that the one who washes should wipe. His course shall be referred to the Annual Council, if any objections whatever are urged against him. He shall go to Virginia, where he was chosen to the ministry, and be installed in his office, according to the order of the church, and be subject to the church.

"W. C. THURMAN."

1880 ART. 11. What shall be done with brethren that teach that Christ ate the legal Passover on the night in which he instituted the bread and wine? Answer: Such teachers should cease to teach so, as it is not the teaching of God's word. And if they will not cease doing so they should be dealt with according to Matthew xviii.

1900 ART. 6. Is it right, according to the Scriptures, for brethren to preach or advocate the doctrine that man is not born of the Spirit until and only through the resurrection of the body? And if not, what shall be done with brethren who do so? Answer: No, not in accordance with the Scriptures. See St. John 1. 12, 13; also, 3. 5; Rom. 6. 3, 4, 5; I Peter 1. 22, 23. And brethren who do so should be admonished to do so no more; and if they do, they should fall into the judgment of the church.

Dress

1883 ART. 2. Inasmuch as we, the brethren and sisters of the Old German Baptist Church, have resolved that we strictly adhere to a plain and decent uniformity of dress, as soldiers of King Emanuel, would it not be well if this Annual Meeting would more particularly define the sisters' dress, in order that there may be more of a uniformity in giving shape to their garments? Say, for instance, bonnet straight, not rounded at the corners; neckerchief or cape large enough to cover the shoulders, and not rounded at the corners; apron not rounded; no lace, ruffles, or any superfluities on any of their garents. (See I. Timothy ii. 9; James i. 21.) In short , carry out the profession of non-conformity to the world in at least some degree of uniformity in giving shape to garments. Answer: This Annual Meeting grants the request named in the query. We think it is just as necessary for our beloved sisters to be in uniformity in shape of dress as the brethren. But this Annual Meeting recommends the handkerchief for fear that two orders may be obtained. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

(I Corinthians i. 10) "As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves acocrding to the former lusts in your ignorance." (I. Peter i. 14)

1888 ART. 2. Inasmuch as the ancient brethren in the year of 1804, Art. 9, do say: "Concerning the evil which grieves God and angels in heaven, and also the faithful souls on earth, namely, the new fashions which are in vogue in the world, and also here and there are believers who gratify too much the lust of the eye (Number xv. 39), and conforming therein themselves to the world; and especially our youth is corrupting itself herein so much that the Lord has almost cause to complain that all flesh has corrupted its way; therefore it has been unanimously deemed good that the bishops and ministers, as also all fathers and mothers of families, should use all diligence to counteract such things that they might spread no further, but rather be put out of the way." Therefore, we have sufficient reason to convince us that the evil alluded to, is growing no less in these last days. Would it not be advisable and good, for the Yearly Meeting of 1888 to give the general brotherhood a form of dress for the members' children, so the members may unitedly counteract the aforesaid evil? And it appears that there is a uniformity of form required by the gospel, and by the order of the ancient brethren, in all things wherein it is practicable, let it be in children's dress, or in anything else that may be the cause of dispute, contention and division among the brethren. Answer: While we do not think it advisable to give a definite form of clothing for the members' children, this Yearly Meeting decides that all the members should clothe their children in a plain and becoming manner; no ornamenting with lace, ruffling, or bias pieces, or anything else to gratify "the lust of the eyes," etc.

1909 ART. 2. Inasmuch as buying ready-made clothing is becoming to be a universal practice, even among our brethren, would it not be according to the Gospel and the order of the brethren to adopt the following plan: Let this Annual Meeting appoint a committee of three or five brethren to investigate some manufacturers of ready-made clothing and arrange to have brethren's clothes made in the order of the brethren for every-day wear as well as dress suits. Inasmuch as the claims are so often made that they cannot buy the every-day wear of work clothing in the order, causing some difficulty in the churches, especially in the West, to carry out the order in dress. Answer: We, your sub-committee, do not feel to recommend what this paper asks for; but we do see a great necessity for our members to adhere more closely to the order laid down by the church, not only in Sunday clothing, but every-day clothing as well, and we do feel to advise our dear members that if they cannot buy clothing in the order, to make them at home rather than to break down the order of the church. Passed by the meeting.

1904 ART. 2. Is it right, according to the order of the church and the spirit of the Gospel for brethren to wear attached or standing collars to their shirts? Answer: We agree that it is not according to the order of the church or the spirit of the Gospel for brethren to wear them. (Rom. 12. 2.)

1918 ART. 1. Will not this Y. M. consider the impropriety of our sisters cutting their bonnets flaring in front instead of straight down, the former being a growing custom among our sisters? Will not this Y. M. outline and establish the order that there may be unity of practice and principles? Answer: We, your sub-committee, refer you to Art. 2, 1883 as a sufficient answer to above query. Passed.

1913 ART. 2. Will not this Yearly Meeting give us something that will bring us nearer a oneness, that we may all appear alike and all be faithful to our promise that we made before we were baptized, so that we can all present our bodies a living sacrifice holy and acceptable unto God? Answer: We, your sub-committee, think there is sufficient already on the minutes in regard to plainness of dress and manner of wearing the hair and the beard. See Section 42. Reconsidered minutes. Also minutes of 1866, Art. 47.

We unanimously advise the elders and officials to admonish all members to more strictly conform to the order of the church. I Peter 5: 1, 2, 3. Passed.

Overcoat

1888 ART. 1. We ask this Yearly Meeting to define more particularly the order of the overcoat, giving shape as to cut, as it is causing trouble in the brotherhood. Shall it be with cape or without? We petition this Yearly Meeting to give one order. Answer: We recommend the cape overcoat, believing that cut to be the ancient custom of our "Old" Brethren.

1928 ART. 2. We request the Annual Meeting to strongly advise brethren to wear the cape on the overcoat, also to wear the beard, as it seems we are losing out on these two points of church order, especially in some localities. Official brethren should set an example in all matters of non-conformity to the world, and adhere to the adopted uniform and order of the church. See Rom. 12:2; 1 Thess. 1:4 to 8; 1 Peter 5:1 to 4; and A. M. 1888, Art. 1; 1900, Art. 5; 1913, Art. 2. Answer: We agree to readopt article 2, of 1913 with instruction to the elders to strongly admonish their local congregations on the cape overcoat and the beard. Passed.

Elections: Political (See Voting)

1813 ART. 2. Further, it has been considered in union concerning electioneering, viz., giving votes for officers or men for the assembly or Congress, in order to elect them to their several offices. Inasmuch as the appearance of the times into into which we have come are grievious (it was the time of the war with England), and inasmuch as party spirit has risen so high in the kingdoms of this world that men, and even the heads of government are among themselves at variance ,therefore it has been viewed in union, that it would be much better if no votes were given in at elections for such officers (by the brethren); for so long as there is such division of parties, we make ourselves suspicious and unpropitious on the one side, on whatever side we may vote. Thereby every one that desires to be defenseless (or non-risistant) may readily see what might be best (for him to do). Moreover, is (not only) our land and (but also) almost all empires engaged in war (in Europe especially); hence it was considered to be best to give in no vote, else we might, perhaps, assist in electing such that would afterward oppress us with war. To pray diligently for our government we believe to be our duty, and to call upon the Lord we think will be most acceptable.

1828 ART. 3. Whether brethren may go to the elections? It is the opinion of most of the brethren that we should keep ourselves free (clear) of them.

1835 ART. 16. Concerning going to elections and serving as jurymen. It was considered in both cases, that brethren should hold themselves loose as much as possible, or entirely, which is best. Particularly, no brother should take part in electioneering at an election, which is deemed very hurtful, and should not be among brethren, etc.

1837 ART. 7. How is it considered if members go to the public election and vote, or even previously already electioneer for the candidates of office? It is the advise of the old brethren to keep ourselves also in this respect as free as possible, and rather not go to the election. As regards electioneering, it is the sense of the brethren that no brother ought to interfere so far with the offices and government of this world, according to the word.

1839 ART. 4. Whether a brother may give his house for holding a (political) election in it? The answer was no; it should not be.

1849 ART. 33. Is it safe and proper for the humble followers of Jesus to go to the elections, and take an active part in the political affairs of the country? Considered, as it was always the advice of the old brethren, and as the anointing (I. John ii. 27) will teach every sincere follower of Jesus, that it would be safest, in regard to political elections, to remain as neutral as possible; and, rather than going to the election, to commit the matter, in prayer, to the care of Him, who setteth up and removeth rulers.

1853 ART. 17. Concerning going to political meetings and elections. Considered best not to attend any such at all, inasmuch as the true Christian belongs to another kingdom.

1863 ART. 18. Inasmuch as some brethren manifest a desire to prohibit brethren from voting at our common (political) elections, do not the brethren in Yearly Council see it to be best to make no change differing from the counsel and practice of our ancient brethren in these days of trouble? In the present crisis we recommend that brethren abstain as much as possible from attending elections, according to John xviii. 36; II. Cor. vi. 14-17.

1864 ART. 1. In no less than four papers the question is presented, whether it is right and proper for a brother to go to, or take part in political elections, it being specially stated that it had caused hard feelings and disunion? Answer: We have been led to think that at all times it would be best and most consistent with our profession, and specially most proper and safe in the present critical state of things, to have nothing at all to do with politics, and entirely to abstain from voting. (See II. Cor. vi. 14—17, also Minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1863, Article 18.)

1865 ART. 10. Since the counsel of the brethren, assembled at our Annual Meetings for the last two years, is, that brethren should have nothing to do with politics, and to entirely abstain from voting, how should we deal with such brethren as will not hear said counsel? Answer: We advise that such brethren be admonished in love, again and again, to be subject to the counsel of the Annual Meeting.

1865 ART. 43. A church being in council assembled, agree pretty much unanimously no more to countenance voting at political elections, according to counsel of the Annual Meeting; is it consistent, then, to make a violation of the counsel of said meeting a test of fellowship, if there is no disposition on the part of those who violate said counsel to make an acknowledgment for it? We want a more definite answer than heretofore given. Answer: Such brethren should be admonished again and again, and if they will not adhere to the counsel of the church, then they should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1865 ART. 46. Inasmuch as some districts have taken council to entirely abstain from voting at political elections, what does the Annual Meeting say to those housekeepers and districts that still continue to vote, and cause hard feelings by doing so? Answer: We admonish such housekeepers and districts to submit to the decisions of the Annual Meeting of 1864, query 1; and if they refuse to do so, they will be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1865 ART. 57. Inasmuch as the brethren in last Yearly Meeting advised brethren to abstain entirely from voting, and when one church receives the minutes, they are read to the church, and the members are admonished not to go to the election, and the elder takes the counsel of the church, and there is a united voice not to go, but there are a few brethren who were not present at the council-meeting, and the decision of the church is sent to them, and they are advised not to go to the election; and then some of the brethren go to the election, when the visiting brethren are sent the second time to notify them not to go, but they go again, after which they are requested to come to the council-meeting, but do not come. The church is then admonished to bear with them, and they are admonished again not to go. If, after all this, they still will go, what is to be done with such brethren? Answer: They should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1866 ART. 1. A number of questions being presented upon the subject of voting, and some asking for a repeal of former minutes, the following resolution, as an answr to those questions, was adopted:

Resolved, That we think it most expedient not to repeal any minutes touching voting; that this Annual Meeting recommends to the members of the church to refrain from voting, fearing that by voting we may compromise our non-resistant principles; but we recommend forbearance toward those who vote, not making voting a test of fellowship, hoping that in time they will see with the body of the brethren upon this subject.

1866 ART. 2. Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting has frequently decided against the brethren voting, is it not inconsistent, and even injurious to the brotherhood, for brethren to write, and editors to publish, any thing in opposition to those decisions? Answer: We think that our brethren, who write and print articles, should be very careful not to promote strife and divisions in the church, but peace, love, union, and holiness.

1869 ART. 12. Shall we not determine, at this Annual Meeting, to make voting a test of fellowship? If not, then shall we not leave the whole matter to the decision of the brethren to do as they individually will, with all the discord and confusion we now have throughout the brotherhood? Answer: We conclude to readopt the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1866, Art. 1.

1922 ART. 1. Will the Annual Meeting of 1922 decide and advise whether or not it is right for sisters to go to the polls and vote as they are required to pay poll tax and are privileged to register and vote if they feel to do so? Would it not be best to have a decision that all congregations of our brotherhood might advise the same and that elders and housekeepers may be united in their advices and counsels? Answer: This Annual Meeting decides that it is not right for sisters to go to the polls and vote. Passed.

Employment of Police

1879 ART. 12. Will this district meeting ask Annual Meeting to decide whether it is according to the teaching of the gospel, and the long-established order of the Brethren, for any branch of the church to employ a police force to keep order at their communion meetings or other meetings? Answer: Only in extreme cases.

Encyclopedia, Brethren's

1871 ART. 30. Inasmuch as the brethren are misrepresented and abused by enemies, saying the Brethren's Encyclopedia is our discipline, kept secret by a few leading brethren, would it not be better to advise the publisher to have no more bound? Answer: We do not recognize the Brethren's Encyclopedia to be a discipline of the church, but we consider the reasons given in the query insufficient for making any change in regard to publishing it.

Excluded Members

1822 ART. 13. How shall the church conduct itself toward those members that have been separated from the church? Considered, first, when a member is separated from the church as far as from the kiss, breaking of bread, and church council, such ought to be diligently exhorted according to the evidence of the apostle, but could not be called brother. But when such would not receive the admonition of love, and should fall into more grievous sins, the church has to put them in avoidance, and have no company with them, according to the word of the apostle.

1833 ART. 7. Whether a member has a right to appeal to the yearly meeting, when put back by the council of his church. The answer, not recorded, was similar to the following:

1833 ART. 8. About the making and using of strong drink, a strong testimony was made at this meeting against it.

1837 ART. 1. How it is considered, if a member desires to be no more with the church, and yet has committed no other offense? Since the circumstances are so different, the advice is also different. If a member desires to be off, and doth commit no other offense, we could have patience somewhat longer with such a member than if a member should speak contemptuously of the church; Then the church can judge best how soon to let it withdraw, and to place it according to its desire; yet there ought to be employed all possible diligence to bring back to the flock such souls. But if they will not hear, there would be just cause to put them as they desire.

1837 ART. 6. Whether the sense of the words of the Savior (Matt. xviii), "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican," is the same as the sense of the apostle, when he says (I. Cor. v.), "Have no company with him," etc. It is understood by the meeting almost unanimously, that the expression of the Savior, "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican," excludes a member only so far as from the church-council, from the kiss and the breaking of bread; but that it is the sense of the apostle, when he speaks of the vicious, "Have no company with him, and after noticing the vices adds yet, "with such a one (you ought) no not to eat," that we ought to avoid such a one altogether according to the sense of the word.

1843 ART. 11. Whether a teacher, that is not ordained, can excommunicate a deacon or visiting brother on but one brother's testimony, and with only twelve members in council? The view of the brethren assembled is, that in consideration of the words of the apostle (I. Tim. v. 19): "Against an elder (which word is taken in the New Testament sometimes in a more limited, and at other times in a more general sense, and may include all those to whom is intrusted an office in the church.) receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses." In consideration again, that as a brother that is not ordained, ought not to hold an election and install teachers or deacons, so none ought to be excommunicated without ordained brethren being present; and in consideration lastly, that in such a case all the members of the church, or as many as possible, ought to be present, we could not approve such a proceeding.

1846 ART. 5. If a member sinneth or is disobedient, so that he is separated from the church, whether he should be publicly excommunicated, as well as he has been publicly received into the church? Considered, that as we do not receive members into the church without the private counsel of the church, so it would be inconsistent with the gospel to exclude them in any other way than by the private counsel of the church.

1852 ART. 19. How is it considered, if a brother is legally expelled from the church, and afterward is taken sick, when he calls for the brethren, and requests of them to be anointed, and the brethren do anoint him, knowing that he is excluded from the church? Considered, that acording to gospel, we have no right to anoint such as are not in fellowship with the church. The Word (See James v.) goes only to the faithful.

1854 ART. 9. If a brother is disowned in one church, and moves to another at a distance, and there desires to be received again, showing symptoms of repentance, acknowledging his fault, and being willing to make reparation as soon as he is able; this being made known to the church from whence he came, repeatedly, but nothing is done, nor any answer given by said church—can he be received under such circumstances by the church where he lives, or not? Considered, according to II. Cor. ii. 6-8, that the church, where a fault has been committed, should act and answer the church where the disowned member lives, without delay.

1859. ART. 18. Is is considered in order for a ministering brother to refuse to labor at home, while he goes out and fills appointments in neighboring churches? Answer: We consider such a course inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel, but recommend that all such questions be investigated at home, in the churches in which they originate.

1859 ART. 19. Is it right for brethren to salute with the holy kiss expelled members, when such go through other districts, and are known by the brethren to be expelled? Answer: We consider it not right to do so; and any brother or sister saluting a person whom he or she knows was expelled, should be admonished, and if he refuses to hear the admonition, he should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1859 ART. 32. How is it considered when ministering brethren from one church will come into another church and preach with an expelled bishop, who is building up a church of his own, and also visit all of the dissatisfied members, causing much confusion and dissatisfaction in the church by doing so; and when lay members go to hear him preach who has been expelled? Answer: We consider it wrong to do so. And such brethren should be admonished, and if they will not be submissive and acknowledge, they should be dealt with according to the gospel.

1859 ART. 29. Can a minister, who is not ordained, with the counsel of the church, expel a member, or must there be an ordained elder present? Answer: It is not necessary for an ordained elder to be present, if the member to be expelled is a private member.

1862 ART. 40. Has a church a right to exclude a member before informing him of the charge they have against him; and if not, what course should a member pursue that has been disowned that way? Answer: The church has no right to do so without duly notifying him, and if they do so, he is entitled to a re-hearing, with the assistance of elders from other churches.

1862 ART. 45. Is it in accordance with the gospel for the standing committee of the Yearly Meeting to send a committee into a church, if desired by such that are expelled from the church according to Matt. xviii., the church having no knowledge of it? Answer: No; but the church which has expelled him should call a committee, if the expelled member requests it.

1862 ART. 46. Is it according to the word of God for such persons as are excommunicated from the church council, the salutation, and the communion, acording to Matt. xviii., to come before the committee, and can their complaints against members be received as evidence? Answer: No.

1862 ART. 47. How is it considered when two members of the church, a visiting brother and his wife, see another visiting brother intoxicated; afterward these two brethren visit the church and commune together, and some two months afterward the first brother named and a private brother saw the same brother again, as they thought, with too much liquor. **Still there is no complaint made** to the church until some six or seven months after the first transgression, though there have been two or three church meetings held in the time. Then the first brother named lays in complaint. What is now the duty of the church in this and such like cases? Answer: We consider both parties are in fault, and they should be dealt with according to Matt xviii.

1862 ART. 49. Should the hand be withheld or offered, as connected with the admonition, in admonishing a brother? Answer: We consider that the right hand of friendship may be offered, supposing it to be included in the admonition.

1862 ART. 56. Is the testimony of one witness sufficient authority to expel a member, under any circumstance, when the accused denies and objects to the testimony? Answer: One witness is not sufficient, in general, but we will not say that under no circumstances one is not sufficient.

1862 ART. 59. If a man and his wife leave one church and go into another, with a recomemndation from the former, which is received by the latter; after awhile the sister leaves her husband, and brother, and returns to the church which she first left, charging her husband with crimes committed before the recommendation was given. Not bringing a recommendation from the church from which she last came, the former receives her or retains her as a member, and acts on the case of her husband and expels him. Did this church do right? Answer: We consider that no church should receive a member from another without a certificate, or to expel a member without a hearing.

1865 ART. 23. When a member is expelled, according to Matt. xviii., and does not ask for a rehearing, or a committee at the time he refuses to hear the church, how long is it thought advisable to allow the right to a rehearing, or is a church in duty bound to grant it at any time? Answer: We consider it best not to limit the time in which a rehearing may be obtained, but an expelled member, wishing a rehearing, should apply for one as soon as practicable.

1866 ART. 25. What do the brethren call fallen members, those that are in avoidance only, or all of them that are put out of the church? Answer: We think that all that are put out of the church by avoidance, or according to Matt. xviii., are so called.

1867 ART. 20. If a brother wrongs a neighbor, who is not a member of the church, by not fulfilling his promise, so that his neighbor suffers damage; and the church, taking the matter into consideration, expels the brother for doing this and other crimes. Now, we wish to know whether the church has the right to receive that brother into the church again before he has made restitution. If it is wrong for a church to do so, what is to be done? What is to be done with a church that has done so? Answer: The proceedings are wrong; and unless the church requires the brother to make restitution, the church shall make restitution.

1871 ART. 16. When a brother has fallen into the judgment of the church, and it takes an action in his case to the dissatisfaction of the brother, and he wants a rehearing or an investigation of the church's proceedings, what is the proper course to be pursued to get a rehearing? Answer: The expelled member shall first apply, through the officers, to the church which acted on the case; if, however, the officers refuse to bring it before the church, the elders in the adjoining churches may call said church together to ascertain whether it will grant a rehearing to the expelled member. But, if the church refuses to grant a rehearing, then the said expelled member should obtain what names of the members in the church he can to a petition to the Annual Meeting for a committee to investigate the case.

1874 ART. 24. Would it be right to grant an expelled preacher, who violated the counsel of the church, and still goes on preaching, a committee, when all the members are opposed to a committee, and if the church would grant a committee, under the existing circumstances, and such a preacher would be found guilty, would it be right for said brethren and sisters to pay the expenses? Answer: No, and such preacher shall be required to provide a sufficient amount to pay such expenses before a committee serve.

Executorship

1821 ART. 2. Whether an ordained or private brother may serve as an executor, where he knows beforehand that the law must be enforced, as has been likewise considered, that it should not be according to the gospel doctrine. But inasmuch as many brethren are in such a position the council is to have patience with them, until they can get through with it, yet so as not to break the bread of communion with them. Since, however, an executorship is very difficult for brethren, it was deemed necessary to adopt measures to obviate or lessen the difficulties. And inasmuch as every parent (or other person of sound mind) has a right to make a will according to his own pleasure, without being interfered with by the authorities, to divide and distribute his property, and also to select his executors, and to order them what they are to do, and how to do it (the testator may insert in his will the following clause), viz.: "I nominate and appoint A.B. to be sole executor of my estate, to settle, pay off, and collect, etc., as far as the rules of our church and the gospel will admit of," etc.

1867 ART. 5. Is it according to the gospel for brethren to act as administrators or executors, in the capacity that the law requires? And if it is, has the church a right to require such to absent themselves from the communion? The Annual Meeting is also requested to reconcile Art. 24, of 1864, with Art. 2, of 1821. Answer: We consider it not advisable for brethren to act in the capacity of administrators or executors, as it is attended with much difficulty. And, as it regards reconciling the two articles above named, there is not really as much difference as at first appears, since in Art. 2, 1821, permission is granted to the brethren to serve in the capacity alluded to, under certain circumstances.

1876 ART. 20. Should a brother (being executor) be allowed, after fearing some of the papers might not be worth full value, to use means to get another brother to go security on said papers, and thereby run the risk of the estate; and shall such executor be allowed to sue such brother, and collect same amount in full, or only the amount the paper was worth before the security was on, the whole matter being under the control of the church? Answer: We consider it wrong, according to our understanding of the case, for the brother who was the executor to get his Christian brother to go on the paper as security, and it was very wrong for the executor to sue his Christian brother.

Fairs and Shows

1835 ART.13. How it is considered when brethren go with their children to shows? Considered, it should not be.

1838 ART. 11. How it is considered when members go to public shows, and even take their children along? Unanimously considered, that members ought to avoid such places, and to warn their children therefrom.

1848 ART. 28. Whether church members have a right, according to the gospel, to go to public shows? Considered, far better for members to avoid all such places.

1853 ART. 29. Is it in accordance with the gospel for brethren to go to the county and state fairs, exhibiting property, or otherwise taking part in the same? Considered, as quite unbecoming and improper for pilgrims being found there. We should remember poor Christian of Vanity Fair.

1859 ART. 14. What shall we do when brethren, and even speakers and bishops, attend yearly the county fairs? Answer: Such brethren should be admonished not to attend such places, and if they still persist in doing so, they should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1866 ART. 15. Is it right for a brother to lease a piece of ground to an agricultural society, for ten years, for the purpose of holding county fairs on? If not, what shall be done with such a brother? Answer: We consider it not right; and we think he should give satisfaction to the church; and should he refuse to do so, let him be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1871 ART. 24. Whereas, it is generally understood by the brethren, that members of the church are not permitted to attend places of merriment, such as state and county fairs, celebrations, circus shows, mass-meetings, and political conventions, and as we can not find any thing in the minutes on the subject, a decision from the Annual Meeting is desired. Answer: We consider that the answer given by the Annual Meeting of 1859, Art. 14, covers and applies to all the cases referred to in the query. The answer to Art. 14, in the minutes of 1859, reads as follows: "Such brethren should be admonished not to attend such places; and if they still persist in doing so, they should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii."

1871 ART. 25. Will this Annual Meeting permit brethren and sisters to attend animal shows? Answer: This Annual Meeting can give no such permit.

1876 ART. 18. Is it right, acording to the gospel and the order of the church, for members to attend the Centennial? Answer: No. (See John xv. 17-19, xvi. 14-16; II Cor. vi. 14-18; I. John iv. 7; James iv. 4.)

Family Worship

1876 ART. 9. How is it considered when brethren receive those of other denominations into their homes, and ask them to give thanks at their tables, and hold family worship? What is to be done in such cases? or does the gospel allow that liberty in any case? Answer: While we would not, under all circumstances, think it wrong to extend the liberty above alluded to, we think the brethren should be careful in granting such liberty. The character of our guests, and the attendant circumstances, should govern in such cases.

1878 ART. 19. This district meeting petitions Anual Meeting to reconsider Article 9 of minutes of Annual Meeting of 1876, and adopt instead of the present, the following, to wit: The gospel allows no such privilege, and members doing so do so on their own responsibility, and throw themselves into the judgment of the church. Answer: We can not make the change proposed.

Far Western Brethren

1850 ART. 25. There is a body of people, or brethren, in the far West, whose doctrine and practice is somewhat different from ours. Some of our brethren live near, or almost among them. Now, the question arises, are the brethren privileged, according to the gospel, to hold communion with them, under existing circumstances? Considered, that, according to the gospel, and the constant practice of the church, it would not be advisable for brethren to commune with them, until a union is effected, and they are agreed to practice according to the ancient order of the church. I Cor. iv. 17.

1852 ART. 1. Proceedings of a council-meeting, held November 22, 1851, in Adams County, Illinois, by the brethren known as Western Brethren, with propositions for a reunion with the body of our brotherhood, represented in this meeting. After the differences having been stated, and considerable conversation had on the subject, it was finally concluded, that this meeting does not feel satisfied how a full and true union can be obtained on the propositions made by the Western Brethren, and that therefore this matter should be postponed until the dear brethren in the West become better acquainted still with the grounds of our practice; and meanwhile we should exercise charity and Christian love toward them.

1852 ART. 2. A letter from Jefferson County, Iowa, referring to the differences existing between the brethren, called the Western brethren, and those of our brethren settled around and among them, from the East, and wishing to be guided in their intercourse with them by the council of this meeting. Considered, as answered by the foregoing decision.

1855 ART. 29. Request for a committee to Illinois, to confer with the far-western brethren, or a committee of them, to investigate the differences in doctrine and practice existing between them and us, and report to the next Annual Meeting. Granted, and Brethren Abraham Maas, Christian Long, John Metzger, Samuel Lehman, James H. Tracey, David Hardman, John Bowman, Daniel Frey, Daniel P. Sayler, John H. Umstad, and James Quinter, appointed for this business.

1859 ART. 35. Several communications were sent to this Annual Meeting from the brethren hitherto distinguished as Western brethren. From these communications we shall give some extracts, as we have not room upon the minutes to give them entire:

"Beloved Brethren: We, the brethren in Adams County, Illinois, met together in council to take into consideration the course we had best adopt respecting the Yearly Meeting. On account of the great distance we are from the place of meeting, and none of us being in a situation suitable to take such a journey, we have concluded to send you these lines to inform you that after we received the minutes of last conference, held in Indiana, we called a church council, and we concluded, for the sake of union in the brotherhood to adopt the minutes of last Yearly Meeting and we intend to carry them out as near as circumstances will admit of. * * * * * *

"We further state that we are willing to counsel and be counseled by the Yearly Meeting." Signed by Elder George Wolf, and others, by order of the church.

The following extract is from a letter from Suger Creek Church, Sangamon County, Illinois:

"We have unanimously agreed to be fully united with our beloved elder brethren, to counsel and be counseled. And we have put in practice the order in receiving and baptizing members, non-swearing and non-conformity to the world." Signed by Elder **Isham Gibson, and** others, by order of the church.

From the brethren in Hurricane Creek district, Bond County, Illinois:

"Dear Brethren in the Lord: Considering your love and care for us as manifested by your kind forbearance and long suffering toward us, we in love to you and all saints, thought it good to send you this epistle, and also brother Daniel B. Sturgis, delegate from this district, witnessing that we desire full fellowship and union. And we unanimously agree to be counseled by the brethren, and submit to all the decisions of our beloved brethren in conference. We believe the best good of all is maintained by a full subjection to the decisions of the Yearly Meetings, published in the minutes." Signed by Daniel B. Sturgis, and others, by order of the church.

The following is the expression of this Annual Meeting upon the subject referred to in the above communications: Whereas, it is known that what have been called the Western brethren have not heretofore been in perfect union with our churches in observing the ordinances and regulations in the house of God; and, whereas, a number of communications have come before this council-meeting from said brethren, expressing a strong desire to be in full fellowship with our brotherhood, and promising to submit to and be governed by the rules by which we think the house of God should be governed; therefore, considered that we have cause to thank God that the efforts made to bring about a union have been so successful, and we are now happy to recognize them as being in full fellowship with us.

Fashionable Garments (Conformity to World)

1804 ART. 9. Concerning the evil which grieves God and angels in heaven, and also the faithful souls on earth, namely, the new fashions which are in vogue in the world, and also here and there are believers who gratify too much the lust of the eye (Num. xv. 39), and conforming therein themselves to the world; and especially our youth is corrupting itself herein so much that the Lord has almost cause to complain that all flesh has corrupted its way; therefore it has been unanimously deemed good that the bishops and ministers, as also all fathers and mothers of families, should use all diligence to counteract such things that they might spread no further, but rather be put out of the way; especially when persons desire to be received (in the church) it should be laid before them, that such things are contrary to the wholesome doctrine, and that it is their duty to deny themselves; and when they are willing to lay them aside, then they may be baptized in hope, that they will permit themselves to be further instructed, etc.

1847 ART. 9. How is it considered, if a brother, or a sister, should have two suits of clothes, one of them plain, to go to meeting in, and one after the fashion of the world, to go to other gatherings in? Considered, by the brethren present, that it is very unbecoming for members to do so, and that it would be the duty of the teachers faithfully to admonish such brethren and sisters again and again, if necessary, not to conform to the world in their dress and habits, as the apostles, also, have warned us. (See Rom. xii. 1, 2; I Tim. ii. 9; I Pet. iii. 3, 4).

1849 ART. 3. Can it be allowed for brethren to wear fur or cloth caps, and sisters to wear trimmed-straw or leghorn bonnets? Considered, to be inconsistent with the word of God, and therefore it ought not to be.

1858 ART. 6. How are we to proceed with members who come to our love-feasts, from other congregations, and who when they leave home are dressed after the gay fashions of the world, and during the day change their dress several times, and put on in the evening a plainer dress to go to the communion table? Is it enough simply to admonish such members, or should the church in which they live be informed? And must we indeed commune with such members, when some of the members in the church are grieved by such conduct? Considered, that it is wrong for members to do so, but they should not be debarred from the privilege of communing until the brethren of the district in which they live have been informed, and until they have been reproved, and afterward continue disobedient.

1866 ART. 27. Inasmuch as pride and an inclination to follow the fashions of the world are still increasing among us, in wearing fine apparel, frock and sack coats, dusters, shawls, etc., with the hair parted off to one side, or shingled and roached, moustaches, etc.; the sisters also wearing fine apparel, going without caps, wearing hoops, hats, veils, overcoats, jewelry, etc.; and, as admonition, in some cases, has not affected any thing, can not this Yearly Meeting propose some plan by which this growing evil may be arrested? Answer: We think members of the church, conforming to the fashions of the world as above stated, should be admonished again and again, and if they will not hear the church, the Savior has given directions in Matt. xviii. how to deal with them.

1868 ART. 19. As there are some members who do not heed to the admonition given by the Annual Meeting of 1866, Art. 27, will this meeting come to some plan that all the churches will carry out said admonition? Answer: Considered the duty of each church to heed the instructions of the Annual Meeting, in any one or all of the different cases therein named.

1868 ART. 20. Will this meeting consider the query of the Annual Meeting of 1866, Art. 27, allowing brethren three certain modes of wearing their hair? And, if approved of, we wish this meeting to give gospel for the same. Answer: Considered, that in absence of direct Scripture, it is well for the younger to be subject to the older.

1871 ART. 22. We desire an explanation, with an answer, on the words "again and again," used in answer to Art. 27, of the Annual Meeting of 1866, as the word or words, "again and again," is or are not scriptural language. Hence, how often must an offending member be admonished to be admonished again and again, before an action can be taken against it? Answer: We still feel, as the brethren have always felt, that it is difficult to lay down a definite rule to apply to all cases concerning the subject alluded to in the query. We think that the wisdom of the churches should dictate the proper method of treating such cases. Where the general conduct of members is such as becomes the gospel of Christ, and there seems to be no inclination to follow the fashions of the world, and their apparel is modest and not gay, forbearance should be exercised toward such members, hoping they will in time adopt the plain garment, as this is considered one of the peculiarities of our fraternity, and in accordance with the Christian grace of simplicity taught in the gospel. In cases, however, where members, instead of conforming to the order of the brethren in plainness of dress, conform to and follow the fashions of the world, such should be dealt with more rigorously; and, if after several admonitions, there seems to be no improvement, they should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii; and in dealing with such cases, both the salvation of souls and the purity of the church should be kept in view.

1881 ART. 19. In minutes of Annual Meeting of 1866, Article 27, sisters' overcoats are classed with jewelry and other vain things. Shall, therefore, sisters who wear plain overcoats, for this be dealt with according to Matthew xviii? Answer: No. (Recon. Min).

1884 SEC. 42. NON-CONFORMITY. We find that there are minutes that allow of different ways of wearing the hair, etc. For the sake of unanimity of practice we adopt the counsel given in Article 27, 1866, which is as follows: "Inasmuch as pride and inclination to follow the fashions of the world are still increasing among us, in wearing fine apparel, frock and sack coats, dusters, shawls, etc., with the hair parted off to one side, or shingled and roached, moustaches, etc., — the sisters also wearing fine apparel, going without caps, wearing hoops, hats, veils, overcoats, jewelry, etc., — and as an admonition, in some cases, has not affected anything, can not this Yearly Meeting propose some plan by which this growing evil may be arrested? Answer: We think members of the church conforming to the fashions of the world as above stated should be admonished again and again, and if they will not hear the church the Savior has given directions in Matthew xviii. how to deal with them." (Accepted.)

1896 ART. 3. Inasmuch as we have no advice from Annual Meeting whether it be right or wrong to wear, or put on gold in filling or plating teeth, or crown or clasp for the same, or wearing or adorning of gold, is it right, according to 1 Timothy ii 9, and 1 Peter iii. 3, 4. Answer: We would advise our members, according to the gospel, not to put on or wear gold in any form whatever, so as to be seen by the public, according to I Tim. ii. 9, and I Peter iii. 3, 4.

1913 ART. 3. Inasmuch as there is some difference among the offending members on the query on Article 5, 1837, on sale crying, will not the Yearly Meeting of 1913 give a more scriptural answer on sale crying? Answer: We, your sub-committee, agree that Article 5, 1837, is in line with the Spirit of Scriptures. See Matt. 5. 16; 1 Cor. 10. 32; 1 Thess. 5. 2. Passed.

1923 ART. 3. Inasmuch as one query of 1922 was laid down and two others were sent back and no reason given why no counsel was given, many members feel that by so doing the disorders upon which counsel was asked were encouraged. Therefore, we pray this A. M. to reconsider said queries and refer them to former minutes as a reason for laying down and sending back as follows:

(1 Query laid down. This A. M. refers members to A. M. of 1872, Art. 21, and A. M. of 1874, Art. 6, and A. M. of 1893, Art. 2, instead of laying down.

(2) Queries sent back. This A. M. refers members to the charge and promise of elders when ordained, in Art. 31. Also the charge and promise in the first degree, reprint of Art. 8 of 1874. And also the charge and promise when installing into the second degree, also including visiting brethren's charge, in Art. 15, reprint of Art. 15, 1835. Also A. M. of 1866, Art. 27. Also A. M. of 1883, Art. 2, Sec. 42, instead of sent back.

And further, advise against all other late fashions, such as buying expensive and fashionable automobiles instead of buying cheap and plain ones as defined by A. M. of 1919, Art. 2, and sisters wearing coats instead of shawls, loose waisted dresses, bib aprons, short dresses and combing their hair down on their foreheads and ears. Thereby correcting such disorders as defined in all our recognized minutes above referred to. Therefore, since all officials thus charged and promised when installed, as above referred to, we ask this A. M. to advise that elders in charge see that officials come in order first, and then others, and if officials refuse to heed such counsel they fall in the judgment of the church. And if elders in charge refuse to take up said disorders, then it becomes the duty of adjoining elders to see that order is maintained as defined in all our reconsidered minutes, and record the foregoing on the minutes. Thereby the Brotherhood reaffirming her purpose to carry out all the principles of the Gospel as accepted in the Resolutions of 1881. Answer: We your sub-committee agree to reconsider said queries, and that Art. 2 of 1893, is sufficient with its answer to lay down said query of 1922. Also, we agree to grant their request referred to in queries sent back. And we feel that we have sufficient on the minutes as touching pride and extravagance, and urge our dear members to more strictly conform to former minutes as obedient children of King Immanuel. See Reconsidered Minutes, Section 42. Passed.

1924 ART. 1. First: Inasmuch as it was generally understood that A. M. unanimously granted all requests asked for in query, Art. 3, of 1923, whereas the answer does not grant the requests referring to former minutes to be restricted to order, but makes null and void the further requests touching late fashions referred to by saying: "And we feel we have sufficient on the minutes," thereby cutting out said last requests entirely which were not on the minutes, hence encouraging them as well as hindering elders and house-keepers to restrict them to order as requested in latter clause of the query, as well as things referred to on the minutes previous to that time. This no doubt occurred because of not distinguishing between sub-committee's answer and the final conclusion of A. M. to unanimously grant all the requests.

Therefore we pray this A. M. to reconsider the answer to Art. 3 of 1923 and make null and void said answer for the above reasons being so complicated, and grant all the requests asked for, and the same to be put on the minutes.

Furthermore from henceforth let all conclusions of A. M. be written and then read before the open council.

Second: Inasmuch as many members believe that Art. 3 of 1923 was passed on the last proposition put before the meeting, and whereas the answer to said query does not harmonize with said proposition, we therefore ask this yearly meeting to carefully reconsider Art. 3 of 1923 and answer same in harmony with the Gospel and the established order of the Brotherhood.

Answer: This meeting grants all the requests in the query of Article 3 of 1923 instead of the answer of the sub-committee which was passed last year. Further, all answers to queries shall be read before the open council before they are passed upon. Passed.

Farmers' Club

1874 ART. 22. Is it consistent with the gospel, or the order of the brethren, to join the farmer's club, and even act as officers in the same? Answer: Not consistent with the gospel to unite with any organized body of the world, and any member that will not abandon it, after being admonished so to do, shall be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

Fasting

1850 ART. 42. Is it consistent with the gospel for the brethren to recommend to the churches a day of fasting, to be observed annually, and to have it published in the Minutes of the Annual Meeting? Considered, inasmuch as the gospel teaches us to fast and pray, to always pray, and never faint; and the Great Teacher says, a certain species of evil spirits can not be cast out but by fasting and prayer, we hope that every Christian shepherd will teach his flock to pray and fast oftener than once a year, as we do not know the time when he that goeth about as a roaring lion may tempt or deceive us.

1851 ART. 10. Would it be proper to reconsider the forty-second query of 1850, or was it correctly answered. Considered correctly answered.

1853 ART. 20. Whether brethren should observe days of fasting appointed by the President of the United States, or the governors of the respective states in which we live? Considered, that brethren should pray always, and not faint, and also to fast as often as practicable. But, considering Rom. xiii. 1-7, and also xiv. 5, 6, it should be left optional with the churches and members to observe such days, or not, as they are "fully persuaded in their own minds."

1867 ART. 23. Do not the Scriptures enjoin fasting, in connection with prayer, as a frequent service? And will not this meeting recommend it, as a means of promoting a higher degree of perfection and holiness? Answer: We think that according to the Scripture fasting, in connection with prayer, is attained with great advantage to those who observe it, and we earnestly exhort the brethren not to neglect this duty and privilege, as a private institution (Acts x. 30); and that in important cases it should be enjoined upon the members as a means of sanctification and qualification for important duties. Acts xiii. 1-3.

Feasting

1871 ART. 18. Is it right for members of the church, even elders and deacons, to make dinners or feasts on Sundays, or on other days, spending much time in baking and cooking, and setting their tables with many luxuries, and then inviting other members, and such as are not members, to come and feast with them; and then, while eating, be engaged in vain conversation, such as jesting and joking, and perhaps eating to excess? Answer: We consider it utterly wrong for brethren to do so. (See Eph. v.; 1 Peter iv.)

Feet Washing

1812 ART. 2. Concerning **feet-washing**, inasmuch as it has happened sometimes that members are permitted to have their feet washed by other denominations, who also practice feet-washing at their breaking of bread, yet not quite according to the word as we can understand it, it is considered advisable that it should not be proper to take part in such imperfect exercises, etc.

1841 ART. 2. Whether the brethren practice feet-washing strictly according to the gospel? Considered, after much conversation and reflection, that feet-washing, as practiced hitherto by the brethren, is according to the word, and that the mode, as far as we could learn until now, could in no wise be improved.

1845 ART. 12. About practicing feet-washing more according to the example of Christ, it was considered, as in 1841, that our practice hitherto was according to the Word, and that we could not improve it.
(Special)

1846 ART. 7. Is it obligatory for all the members of the church to wash feet, to follow the example of Christ? Answer: That we should make no change in the observance of this ordinance, but that every member should, as soon as possible, fulfill this command: "Ye ought to wash one another's feet."

1848 ART. 21. Whether it would not be more according to the word of St. John's gospel (xiii. 15), that a brother should both wash and wipe his brother's feet? Considered, that the brethren still think as they did seven years ago, in this respect. (See Minutes of 1841, Art. 2.)

1849 ART. 39. Whether it would not be more according to the gospel, in the observance of feet-washing, for the brother, at the head of the table, to wash and wipe the feet of the brother on his right hand, and that brother to wash and wipe the feet of the next, and so on, around the table? Considered, that as this question has so often been before the council, and that the manner of its observance could not be amended, we are still of the opinion, that the command is fully obeyed, if we wash our feet among one another, as rendered by the German translation; but we would recommend to each brother and sister, at the earliest opportunity, to obey the command to wash, and that in washing, the members should change frequently.

1853 ART. 45. Inasmuch as there had been a difference in the form of words, in administering baptism, settled and brought to a union some years ago, could we not, also, come to a full union and agreement with regard to feet-washing, the Lord's Supper, etc., so that a member from one section would find in every other section the same celebration, in manner and form, as at home? Considered to refer this to the next Yearly Meeting.

1854 ART. 10. As there is some difference of opinion respecting John xiii. 5, the question arises, whether one and the same member shall perform the double act of washing and wiping the saints' feet? Considered, in the same light as it was in

1849 (Art. 39), that the manner of feet-washing could not be amended, inasmuch as the command is fully obeyed in the way we observe it.

1867 ART. 27. Inasmuch as there are some members who are dissatisfied with the present manner of washing feet, and think that the one that washes should also wipe, can not the Annual Meeting grant a change, and bear with those that wish to practice as they understand it? Answer: We consider it not advisable to make any change in the practice of feet-washing as heretofore practiced by the brethren.

1868 ART. 10. Inasmuch as the questions whether the same member that washes feet should not also wipe, came up again at our district-meeting, we request the Annual Meeting, and the brotherhood throughout, to take this subject into serious consideration. Answer: We think it well to comply with the foregoing request, and also to appoint a committee to visit those churches which practice the ordinance of feet-washing differently to the general order of the brotherhood.

1871 ART. 37. Whereas, this Annual Meeting finds, to its great regret, that the subject of feet-washing, in its single and double mode, as the difference is called, has produced serious difficulties already among us, and threatens still greater difficulties in the future. Questions relating to this subject have come from different localities in the brotherhood and it has assumed such a degree of importance as to commend it to the serious and prayerful attention of the brotherhood. Under these considerations, with much prayerful reflection, the propriety, has suggested itself to us of calling the elders of the brotherhood together to consider this matter, as the apostles and elders did to consider the case of circumcision. Acts xv. 6. We have therefore concluded to request all the ordained elders of the brotherhood to meet in the fear of the Lord, and under a due sense of their responsibility, in solemn assembly, on Whit-Monday, 1872, at the place of our next Annual Meeting, to dispose of this subject as the peace and prosperity of the fraternity require.

In the meantime, no church should be organized under the single mode, neither should any church change from the double to the single mode. And in order to obtain all the information possible to present unto the council of elders above alluded to, we appoint the following brethren as a committee to ascertain, as far as possible, which was the first mode practiced by our brethren in America: D. P. Sayler, Jacob Reiner, and J. Quinter.

1871 ART. 17. The following resolution contains the decision of the meeting upon the subject of feet-washing: Make no change whatever in the mode and practice of feet-washing, and stop the further agitation of the subject.

1875 ART. 17. The following resolution contains the decision of the meeting upon the subject of feet-washing: Make no change whatever in the mode and practice of feet-washing, and stop the further agitation of the subject.

1876 ART. 25. Several queries and requests relative to feet-washing being presented to the meeting, the following was prepared to meet the case: Whereas, the so-called double mode in feet-washing is the recognized mode of the general brotherhood; therefore, the Annual Meeting can not grant the liberty prayed for, and no church can change from the double to the single mode on the authority of the Annual Meeting. Deferred.

1877 ART. 24. As many brethren desire to wash feet by the single mode, will not district meeting earnestly petition the Annual Meeting of 1877 to grant to any church of the Brethren full liberty to wash by each member girding himself or herself, and both wash and wipe the feet of another, when it can be done in peace and harmony? Answer: Inasmuch as the so-called double mode of feet-washing is the order of the general brotherhood, this Annual Meeting can not sanction the practice of different modes; but those churches which wish to observe the single mode we will bear with, when it can be done unanimously and without giving any trouble or offense in the church. And as there are different views on this matter among our brethren, we would caution both members and ministers, in going from one church to another, that they shall not agitate and stir up the minds of the brethren on this subject.

1879 ART. 6. We ask the Annual Meeting, through the district meeting, to say what is to be done, as she says the double mode of feet washing is the general order of the brotherhood, and that she can not sanction the practice of different modes; yet there are churches that know they are divided, and take a vote on feet-washing and ascertain that the majority is in favor of the single mode, while a minority stands with the general order of the brotherhood, and feels too conscientious to let it go. Now we plead with the Annual Meeting, through the district meeting, to say what is to be done in such cases to avoid these troubles. Answer: We can see no better way to avoid such trouble than to follow the last decision of the Annual Meeting, which is to the effect that churches had better not change unless it can be done by unanimous consent. Where there is a small minority it is better to persuade it, if it can be done, than to force that minority to yield.

1881 ART. 23. Inasmuch as there are some brethren living in Meigs County, Ohio, where there is no legal organized church, who have been baptized by the brethren of southern Ohio, and there being much confusion between them and the old brethren of southern Ohio, on the subject of feet-washing, we ask annual conference to reconsider all queries and answers on this subject since 1872, Article 17, and to re-adopt the decision of that year as the rule and practice of the Church of the Brethren. Answer: We decide to re-adopt the decision of 1877 as the best we can do under existing circumstances. **(Recon. Min.)**

1883 SEC. 3. FEET-WASHING. Not in any other way than in the double mode. Minutes of 1872, Art. 17, page 375, approved. All other changes on minutes otherwise strictly cut off. [See Resolutions.] (Accepted.)

Forfeit Money

1861 ART. 5. Is it considered right, according to the gospel for a member to hold forfeit-money under any circumstances whatever? Considered, that it is not right when the holder is not injured by the transaction, and if he is, he should only keep enough to indemnify himself for such loss.

Form of Affirmation

1821 ART. 14. How far a brother is at liberty in giving testimony, to speak the truth before the higher powers, inasmuch as different forms are presented to brethren? Considered, that a brother by no means should take the liberty to lift up his hand, but should obey simply the counsel of the gospel, saying yea, if it is yea, and nay, if it is nay; "for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil."

Fornication

1847 ART. 2. Whether a brother or sister, whose companion has broken the marriage vow by fornication, may marry again according to the gospel, after he or she may have obtained a bill of divorce? It was concluded by the brethren present, that a brother or sister may not. (See Minutes of Yearly Meeting, 1842, Art. 8).

1855 ART. 2. How is it considered, if a brother and sister want to marry each other, and being opposed by their parents (members, too), accomplish their design so late as to bring reproach upon themselves and the church? Considered, that the young members should be dealt with according to the circumstances, so as to prove that the church is not participating in evil, and that the parents should also be admonished, if the church finds them in error.

1855 ART. 18. In case a young sister, being deceived by promises of marriage, and is left afterward, in shame and distress, by her deceiver, can she be retained as a member, if she shows repentance, etc.? This question might be answered with a question of the apostle (I. Cor. v. 6): "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" and it was considered, that such a sister should be expelled, until she comes and makes humble and public acknowledgment of her error before the church, and affords ample proof of sincere penitence.

1855 ART. 23. How it is considered, if a church, having no ordained elder, has a case of gross sin, such as described in I. Cor. v. 11, and application is made to ordained elders to assist them, the elders making an appointment, and failing to attend; has the church a right to put such members back, or ought the church to hold such transgressors as full members, until they can get ordined elders? Considered, that the church may, and ought, to put them back provisionally, when the crime is sufficiently proven, until ordained elders can attend.

1856 ART. 24. If a man shall put away his wife for the cause of fornication—procuring a bill of divorcement, and marrying another—has he committed the sin of adultery, or could he be received into the church, all the parties still living, if he in all other respects brings forth fruits meet for repentance? After a lengthy discussion, this matter was referred to the next Yearly Meeting.

1857 ART. 8. The twenty-fourth query on the minutes of 1856 being brought forward, it was concluded best for such churches as have occasion to act on such cases, to act in the fear of the Lord, according to their knowledge of the cases.

1863 ART. 12. Inasmuch as it is the decision of the council of the Yearly Meeting that members who commit the sin of fornication should be expelled from the church, according to I. Cor. v., how is it considered when a church retains members who have committed that sin, upon a confession of being sorry for it? Answer: Not consistent with the word of God (I. Cor. v.), nor with the ancient order of the church.

1867 ART. 16. Does the fornication committed, as in Matt. xix, 9, place the parties in such a position that they can never be reconciled to each other and live together again? Answer: The guilty party giving evidence of true repentence, they may be reconciled. (See I. Cor. vii. 11; II. Cor. ii. 6, 7.)

1867 ART. 17. We desire this Annual Meeting to consider Art. 18, of the minutes of 1856, and give us the scriptural rule to govern such cases. Answer: If the cause of separation be malice and ill-will, they can not be retained in the church, according to Heb. xii. 14, 15.

(See Under Matrimonial)

1867 ART. 32. Do the words of the Savior, "Except for fornication," as they stand connected with His other language, in the ninth verse of the nineteenth chapter of Matthew **annul** the marriage covenant or contract, or do they only suspend it until fruits worthy of repentance are manifested on the part of the transgressor—to the satisfaction of the church? Considered by this meeting that the words in question do annul the marriage contract. Referred.

1868 ART. 1. Do the words of the Savior, "Except for fornication," as they stand connected with His other language, in the ninth verse of the nineteenth chapter of Matthew, **annul** the marriage covenant or contract, or do they only suspend it until fruits worthy of repentance are manifested on the part of the transgressor—to the satisfaction of the church? Considered, by this meeting that the words in question do annul the marriage contract. Answer: We postpone this question indefinitely, but advise the churches to proceed cautiously when they have cases of this character to act upon.

1870 ART. 14. Whereas, much dissatisfaction exists among the brethren, relative to the answer of the first article of the minutes of 1868, and the insertion of the answer of a district-meeting before the answer of the Annual Meeting, whereby many are unable to understand what the answer of the Annual Meeting to said query was, will the district-meeting agree to ask the Annual Meeting to define plainly to the whole brotherhood, through the minutes of this year, how much of said article is the answer of the Annual Meeting, and authoritative? Answer, yes; for we very much desire a better understanding on that subject, and we therefore ask a reconsideration of Art. 1, of the minutes of 1868. Answer: We agree to reconsider said article, and leave out of the minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1868 the answer of the district of eastern Maryland, which reads as follows: "Considered, by this meeting, that the words in question do annul the marriage contract." And as a large proportion of the brotherhood understand that it only suspends, while others understand that it annuls the marriage contract, and viewing this difference of sentiment among us, and the majority believing that fornication only suspends the marriage contract, and as the tendency of the practice of the age is toward too great a looseness of the binding power of the marriage vow, we think it most advisable, for the present, to act in the church as if the marriage contract is only broken by death.

1873 ART. 19. What is to be done in case one of the members of the church pleads guilty in the act of fornication, is it the duty of the housekeeper of said church to take the voice of every member present, whether such an one is only to be excommunicated, or put in avoidance, or is it the duty for such housekeeper to put such a member into avoidance at once, according to I. Cor. v? Answer: We consider that an elder has no right to either expel a member from the church, or to put him in avoidance, without the counsel of the church.

1879 ART. 18. Will this district meeting ask Annual Meeting to modify Article 12, of 1863, which compels churches to disown members that have not kept themselves as they ought to have done before they were married? We ask to have it modified, so as to give each church the privilege to decide as they understand the case, as there is quite a difference in cases. Answer: We decide to make no change on the foregoing question.

1879 ART. 19. A woman marries, and her husband leaves her and lives with his brother's wife; his wife sues at law, proves him guilty of fornication, obtains a bill of divorce, afterwards marries another man, and then makes application for membership. Under the circumstances can she, according to the gospel, be received? Deferred by Annual Meeting.

1938 ART. 8. Inasmuch as there seems to be a difference of understanding in the Brotherhood as to disposing of cases that come within the teaching of Paul's first letter to the church of Corinth, **fifth chapter, wherein he points out** in verse one, an existing evil act among them, and taught them throughout this chapter how to proceed in such a case: Now, in view of Paul's teaching and the general tenor and spirit of God's word, can a local church which may have cases somewhat similar to deal with, wherein the same act was committed by members who afterward marry, after having considered all evidence and testimony and attitudes in the case, forgive and retain such members in fellowship upon their open confession and expression of sorrow, or shall they be disfellowshipped?

Also, do the 36th, 37th and 38th verses of I Cor. 7, have any reference to fornication?

Now, we do earnestly beg this Annual Meeting of 1938, to give a definite answer to the above that a more uniform understanding may be had among us on this very important subject.

Answer: According to the Scripture upon the subject and the Minutes of A. M. 1855, Art. 18 and 1863, Art. 12, any member found guilty of fornication must be excommunicated. The verses 36, 37, 38, of 1 Cor. 7, have no reference to the above, but purely to a condition of father and daughter. Passed.

Full Report of A. M.

1870 ART. 1. Should not a full report of questions and answers passed by the Annual Meeting be given, instead of merely referring to former decisions? Answer: We think a full report of the answers should be put into the minutes when they are not too long.

1870 ART. 9. Whereas, a number of the district-meetings have sent to this Annual Meeting an expression unfavorable to a reporter making a full report of the proceedings of our Annual Meeting, therefore we resolve that no report by a reporter be made.

1873 ART. 6. We request district-meetings and the Annual Meeting to decide that no report of the proceedings of our Annual Meetings, further than the queries and answers thereto, be published. Answer: We decide that a synopsis of the reasons given as a basis for decision, may be given, but no names of speakers be used, and that the publishers shall be responsible to the Annual Meeting for their report.

1874 ART. 1. As Art. 6, of the Annual Meeting of 1873, allows only the publishing of a "synopsis of the reasons given as a basis for decision, but no names of speakers," will not this Annual Meeting allow the publishing of a full report of the proceedings of the Annual Meeting, together with the names of the speakers? Answer: We make no change.

1875 ART. 8. Inasmuch as there are queries before this meeting both in favor of and against a full report of the proceedings of this meeting, and as there seems to be a difficulty in answering these questions with the unanimity desirable, we think it best to defer the subject until the next Annual Meeting.

1876 ART. 2. Whereas, the question of a full report has been before the Annual Meeting time and again for consideration; and whereas, upon the propriety of such a report a difference of opinion obtains among the brethren; therefore, resolved that this meeting will not assume the responsibility of granting such a report. But should any brethren publish it, they shall be held responsible for any wrong that may be committed in doing so. And we also decide that it shall not be published in any of our periodicals.

(Recon. Min.)
1883 SEC. 15. FULL REPORT OF SPEECHES of Annual Meeting. We endorse the decisions of 1870, Art. 9, Repudiate all others. (Accepted.)

Funerals

1819 ART. 5. Whether it is not displeasing in the sight of God that there is so much conformity to the world at **funerals,** with the superfluity of drink as well as the superabundance of eatables, besides what is needful and proper? Considered, that all superfluity in meat and drink, together with all extravagance in clothing, is an abomination in the sight of God, which we ought to avoid by all means, that the body of Christ may not be mixed up so much with the body of the world (especially at such solemn occasions as funerals).

1844 ART. 11. Whether our brethren have the liberty, in cases of funerals, to let preachers of other denominations preach in their houses? Considering circumstances, such as a burying-ground being on the farm of a brother, the weather being inclement, etc., such liberty could not be denied to brethren.

1851 ART. 19. How are the brethren, when called upon, to proceed in holding funeral services? Considered, that according to the general and ancient practice of the brethren, we would advise, that, in all cases, the services should be begun and concluded by singing and prayer.

1855 ART. 8 Whether it is agreeable with the word of God to erect tombstones? Considered, that it would not agree with the principles of the gospel, such as humility, non-conformity to the world, etc., to erect large and expensive tombstones.

1856 ART. 8. How is it considered, when a brother of another district is solicited to preach a funeral fails to attend, and the brethren who reside in the district attend and preach the funeral, and afterward, the elder, who is a relative of the deceased, has the funeral preached over again? Considered, that elders ought to be careful not to wound the feelings of their fellow-laborers by sending for others to do their work over again.

1858 ART. 29. Is it right to give liberty to other denominations to preach funeral sermons in our meeting houses? Answer: It is right, especially if preached on the day of the funeral.

1862 ART. 53. Is it in accordance with the gospel to pronounce a benediction over the people at the close of a funeral service at the grave? And if so, what should be the form? Answer: We have no authority in the gospel for doing so, and no such custom among the brethren to sanction it.

1865 ART. 27. What portion of God's word furnishes us with authority, either by commandment, precedent, or example, for funeral preaching, and especially after the interment has been done for months and even years? Answer: We have positive scriptural authority to preach the word at all times and on all occasions when called on. (See II. Tim. iv. 2.)

1866 ART. 7. Is it according to the order of the gospel for brethren, being mourners, to keep their hats on in time of funeral services, at prayer, and preaching, etc.? And should brethren dress their dead after the fashion of the world? Answer: We think not; for the apostle says: "It is a shame for a man to pray or prophecy having his head covered" (I Cor. ii.); and we think a white shroud becomes our dead the best.

1886 ART. 1. Should brethren allow themselves to be craped and gloved when serving as pallbearers? Answer: They should not, according to the ancient order of the brotherhood; also contrary to the Word of God. See Luke xvi. 15.

1886 ART. 2. Is it right for members of the Church of Christ —and who are mourners—to sit with hats on, and not bow down upon their knees in time of prayer? Answer: Refer to minutes of 1819, Art. 5, and think members should bow down in time of prayer. See Psalms xxxviii. 6; Luke xxiv, 5; Phil. ii. 10.

1886 ART. 3. How is it to be considered when ministers of our beloved fraternity lead and go before the funeral procession? Answer: This meeting advises best not to go before such processions when it can be reasonably avoided.

1876 ART. 13. Is it right for members to get those fine, costly, and fashionable burial cases to bury their dead in, and to employ a fashionable hearse to convey them to the burying-ground in? Answer. We decide it is not right for brethren to do so.

1878 ART. 8. Would it not be well for the brethren in district meeting to consider the evil tendency of too much expensive feasting at funerals? Answer: We think that brethren everywhere should use their influence against it. The Annual Meeting confirms the decision of the district meeting.

Grange Society

1872 ART. 8. Can the church tolerate a member in the body that is a member of the society or order called Grange or Patrons of Husbandry? Answer: No brother or sister should have anything to do with such an order, it being a secret-bound, and from appearance, a political association and members who have united with it, and persist in it, should be dealt with as transgressors. (See Minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1870).

1878 ART. 3. Will this district meeting petition Annual Meeting to reconsider Article 8 of minutes of Annual Meeting of 1872, concerning the "Grange," as we are informed that it is not an oath-binding or political association? It was agreed to forward the foregoing to the Annual Meeting, and in addition to it, to ask the General Conference to give us the more objectionable features of the "Grange," whether it be oath or secretism. Answer: We can not reconsider said query, because both the oath and the secretism are contrary to the gospel. (Matt. x. 17; John xviii. 20; II Cor. vi. 15-18; Eph. iv. 10-12.)

Hunting, Advertising Against

1891 ART. 1 Inasmuch as we are now living in a time in which our nonconforming and nonresistant principles are being tried in various ways, we pray the brethren assembled in Yearly Council to take into serious consideration the impropriety of our members advertising against hunting by erecting boards on their premises, or otherwise using terms having the appearance of evil and infringing upon our non-resistant and nonconforming principles which we desire to hold sacred under all circumstances. Therefore, that peace and unanimity continue to exist, and that the members of the church fully comply with 1 Cor. i. 10. and Rom. xii. 1, 2, etc., we ask Annual Council to advise and decide against such measure and steps taken by us professing Christ and his doctrine. Answer: This Annual Meeting advises brethren not to do so, according to the above scriptures.

Hymn Books

1849 ART. 38. Whether our hymn-books, now in use could not be improved, by a better selection? Considered, that the hymn-books we have, answer our purpose very well.

1858 ART. 23. What does the Annual Meeting think of taking the preparatory steps for producing a new hymn-book? Referred to the next Annual Meeting.

1860 ART. 9. We, the brethren, assembled in general district council, at the Valley meeting-house, in Botetourt County, Virginia, desire that the brethren in the Annual Council meeting of 1860 devise some plan or way to remodel, or enlarge by appendix, our hymn-book, so as to satisfy the wants of the brethren. Answer: To comply with the above request, this Annual Meeting appoints a committee of five to make a new hymn-book, with the understanding that as many of the hymns in the present book as possible be retained. The following brethren constitute the committee: James Quinter, Ohio; Samuel Garber, Illinois; John Metzger, Indiana; John H. Umstad, Pennsylvania; John Kline, Virginia.

1861 ART. 14. That we are in favor of postponing the revision of our hymn-books. Considered, since a committee was appointed, by last Yearly Meeting, to attend to this business, and circumstances preventing their action, we are in favor of extending the same committee, to consummate the work assigned them at their earliest convenience.

1865 ART. 42. As we profess to be a plain people, is it right for brethren to use gilt-edged hymn-books and Bibles, when plain ones are just as good, and more becoming our profession; and should the brethren be allowed to make and sell such? Answer: We advise the brethren to be careful in such matters.

1868 ART. 18. Whereas, there is a difficulty in introducing the new hymn-book among the brethren where the German language is yet used, as there are none that contain both English and German hymns, would it not therefore be advisable to revise the German hymn-book, and make a small collection of the choicest German hymns, and combine them with the English book, and thus have some books containing both English and German hymns, to meet the wants of our German members and avoid the necessity of having more than one book in the church? Answer: we consider it advisable to do so, and appoint the following brethren as a committee to select a number of German hymns, not exceeding two hundred, to be added to as many of the English books as it is necessary to supply the wants of the German brethren: Paul Wetzel, Henry Kurtz, F. P. Loehr, and D. M. Holsinger.

1872 ART. 18. Whereas, both the new English hymn-book, and also the German, are not used in some few of the churches of our brotherhood; and, whereas, the use of the two books, the old and the new, causes at times considerable inconvenience, and for this and other reasons it is desirable that but one book should be used in our churches; and, whereas, the reason given by some brethren for not introducing the new book, is that the Annual Meeting has never given them its sanction; and, whereas, the English book had, before its publication, been presented to the Annual Meeting for an expression of its judgment upon the character of the work, but for want of time no expression was given; and, whereas, the new books, both the English and the German, have now been before the brotherhood for some time, and have given general satisfaction; therefore, resolved, that this Annual Meeting give the new books its sanction, and liberty to all the members of the churches to use them.

1873 ART. 20. Do the brethren not think it proper to exert their influence against the admission into the church of the new hymn-book with notes? Answer: We advise all districts of churches to keep them out of the church in public worship.

1874 ART. 25. Whereas, the Annual Meeting of 1873, Art. 20, advises all the churches to keep the brethren's tune and hymn-book out of the churches in time of public worship, this district council humbly asks the Annual Meeting of 1874 to reconsider the said query, and allow district churches, that wish to do so, to use them even in public worship. Answer: This Annual Meeting thinks it best upon the reconsideration of said query, to let this subject remain as it was decided at the last Annual Meeting.

1876 ART. 5. Inasmuch as the brethren's hymn-book, as now published, is very deficient in selections adapted to the wants of the church, and also contains a large number of badly-composed hymns, this meeting petitions the Annual Meeting for the privilege of publishing a new book, or to have the present one thoroughly revised. This meeting further petitions that the Annual Meeting appoint for this work a committee of four brethren, thoroughly posted in versification, and then grant to each of our publishing brethren the privilege of publishing their own books, or those they need, to supply their patrons, or else have them published jointly, as may be determined upon by the publishers, but not to be copyrighted. Answer: We think it best to make no change in regard to our hymn-book.

1877 ART. 17. Inasmuch as Annual Meeting ordered the compiling of hymns for the use of the church, and subsequently accepted the collection as the Brethren's hymn book, and inasmuch as we are now perhaps outstripping **all the fashionable** denominations in variety of binding and grandeur, including six or eight different colors, nicely figured lids, gilt edge, metal clasps, etc., to gratify the eye, will not this Annual Meeting put some restrictions upon the publishers, so that we may have more of a sameness in the appearance of our hymn-books, and thus be more consistent with our profession? Answer: We should not have more than two or three different colors, and they should be plain, and the books should have no ornament or superfluity in the binding, such as gilt or flowering.

1878 ART. 15. Will this district meeting petition Annual Meeting to use its influence toward getting the Brethren's hymn-books at a lower figure and with better binding, for the good of the brotherhood? Answer: The district meeting having petitioned Annual Meeting as requested, the Annual Meeting grants the petition.

1882 ART. 13. Will not this district meeting petition the Annual Meeting to have the old hymn-book printed again, and recommend all the churches to use them, so as to have but one hymn-book in all our churches? Answer: Inasmuch as there seems to be a general desire for a change in our hymn books, or that we have one permanent hymn book, this Yearly Meeting decides that a committee be appointed, who shall proceed to make a suitable selection of about six hundred hymns, and have a substantial book of plain binding, all of one color and quality, offered to the members as soon as it can conveniently be done. Committee: Samuel Kinsey, Aaron Frantz, Henry P. Wherly, Emanuel Miller, John Kimmel.

1883 ART. 5. We earnestly pray this Annual Meeting to order our Hymn Book Committee to collect a suitable and sufficient number of German hymns, print and bind them with our new book, to supply the German members with German and English in the same book. Answer: The above request was granted, with the understanding that a new edition of the old German book be printed, if the plates can yet be obtained on reasonable terms.

1884 ART. 2. Petition and request, through the Standing Committee, to the Yearly Meeting, of greeting: Inasmuch as the plates of our English hymn-book were, by the last Yearly Meeting placed in the care of our beloved Brother Samuel Kinsey deceased, we ask the following: Will this Yearly Meeting put the plates in charge of the Hymn Book Committee, so that the needful corrections may be made; and we further suggest that Bro. Joseph I. Cover be added to fill said vacancy. Answer: This Yearly Meeting approves the request respecting the plates, and to fill the vacancy by the brother suggested.

1884 ART. 3. Furthermore, as the last Yearly Meeting authorized the Hymn-Book Committee to print a limited number of German hymn-books from the old plates of H. Kurtz, deceased, and have them bound in together with the English edition, in case the old German plates can be had of H. J. Kurtz, of Covington, Ohio, at a reasonable price. We, the committee, now inform this meeting that the use of the plates can be had. But as the demand for them (as directed at Yearly Meeting) being so meager, we did not feel justifiable in proceeding to publish the book. We ask this meeting what shall be done. Answer: This Yearly Meeting advises that members who want the German hymn-book, proceed at once to ascertain how many hymn-books they will take (by churches or by single copies) as subscribers, at thirty cents per copy, and report to the Hymn-Book Committee at once; and just as soon as there is a sufficient number subscribed for, let the Hymn-Book Committee give notice publicly of that number which is reported, and when there is enough to justify them to publish the German hymn-book, let the work go on.

1885 ART. 2. We, your committee, report that five hundred copies have been printed and are ready for sale.

The cost of said number of copies		$115.00
Repairs, electrotyping German		1.00
Setting and electrotyping English advertisement		1.75
Incidental preparatory expenses—additional		5.75
		$123.50
Amount subscribed	$97.80	
Amount unpaid	12.60	
	$85.20	
Amount of cash paid, as per receipt		$100.00
		$ 23.50

Balance due committee on all costs, $23.50, up to date, May 26, 1885.

Aaron Frantz, Henry P. Wehrley, Emanuel Miller, John Kimmel, Joseph I. Cover, committee. Answer: This meeting recommends that Bro. Cover pay the balance of the cost of printer's bill as agreed upon (June 1, 1885), and we advise the friends of the German hymn-book, who want them or have not paid their subscription, to send for them at once, accompanying their order with the amount, and diminish the debt.

1903 ART. 4. We the hymn-book committee, hereby wish to inform you that all of the last edition of our hymn books is sold, and all matters pertaining thereto settled up as far as we know. The plates, from which the books have been printed (which are the property of the church), are in the care of Brother Aaron Frantz, and as far as we know, will yet do. We therefore offer our resignation as a hymn-book committee and are now awaiting the desire of the meeting.

(Signed)

AARON FRANTZ,
E. MILLER,
H. P. WEHRLY.

The standing committee thinks that books should be at once issued, and we propose that the committee be renewed, and that they be empowered by this Yearly Meeting to issue a reasonable number of books to supply the demands of the church, using the old plates, as they are in good condition. The book to be bound in good substantial sheep binding.

Passed.

1907 ART. 1. Is it advisable for our ministers to change from the old established usage of the church by singing hymns without lining them? Answer: This Yearly Meeting decides to make no change from our established usage.

1908 ART. 9. The standing committee of this Yearly Meeting suggests that Brethren Jonathan Wenrick and William N. Kinsey be appointed with Brethren Aaron Frantz and Emanuel Miller on the hymn-book committee. And inasmuch as the supply is about exhausted we hereby advise that an arrangement be made for another supply.

Passed and approved.

1916 ART. 3. Inasmuch as there is a custom among us in several different localities for our young members coming together to have singings, and have adopted the use of Hymnals and song books instead of using our hymn-books, and also in some localities amuse themselves by indulging in plays and having a good time, thus conforming to the world not becoming our profession, will not this Annual Meeting restrict such singings or gatherings to only use our hymn-books and have no other amusements in connection with such gatherings? Rom. 12.2; I Peter 1. 14; 1 Cor. 14. 15; Eph. 5. 19. Answer: We, your sub-committee, advise that elders and housekeepers urge their members to use such tunes and hymns as are suitable for general worship, and not to turn these gatherings into worldly amusements. Passed.

1921 It was suggested that Brethren J. C. Darst and J. M. Kimmel be appointed on the Hymn Book Committee, with Brethren Jonathan Wenrick and William N. Kinsey, the only surviving members of said committee, and that they be advised to get another supply of hymn-books made. Approved and passed.

Report of Hymn Book Committee

1927 To the Annual Meeting of 1927, Greeting:

The present edition of our hymn books is about exhausted, another edition will be required, and as we have been given permission in the past to make corrections, we desire to submit the following for your consideration:

Some of the type are so worn that the impression is not perfect and some letters do not show in print.

Some of the hymns are written under wrong meter.

A few hymns require some changing in wording to make better harmony, and other minor corrections are needed.

To make the necessary corrections it may add about 5 to 6 cents per copy on the next edition.

The cost of printing and binding have advanced since the last edition was issued and will also increase the cost of the next.

Requests have been made by a number for a leather binding which will increase the cost to approximately $1.00 per copy for semi-flexible black leather binding.

We suggest to print the next edition in both bindings.

Respectfully submitted: Wm. N. Kinsey, J. C. Darst, J. M. Kimmel, committee.

This Annual Meeting authorizes the Hymn Book Committee to issue a new and corrected edition of the Hymn Book in one binding only.

1927 ART. 2. Inasmuch as there is some difference practiced in lining hymns, is it order to line out four or two lines at a time before singing? Will not this A. M. more definitely decide which is the usual order that all may more fully understand and work by the same rule and order?

Answer: We find no objection to lining either two or four lines depending upon the kind of hymn and circumstances under which it is used. Passed.

1931 ART. 5. We pray this A. M. of 1931 to reconsider Art. 2, 1927, in regard to lining hymns, as some brethren line four lines on any kind of hymn while others line only two lines, making a difference in practice. Answer: We readopt the answer of Art. 2, 1927, and recommend that it be more strictly adhered to to bring about a more uniform practice in the Brotherhood. Passed.

Implements of War

1941 ART. 1. Is it consistent and according to the Gospel, or our conscientious principles, for any of our members to labor in assembling implements of warfare? Further, if it is not, should not this A. M. advise our dear members as to this query.

Answer of sub-committee: We feel that the import of this query is such that we do not think it consistent under present conditions to bring it into open council. Therefore we return it to the Standing Committee for its consideration.

Answer of Standing Committee: We, the present Standing Committee, believe it unwise to put this paper before the open council for discussion. But we believe that our Brotherhood should be kindly advised in relation to the matter represented by the query. Accordingly we would advise as follows:

The present good government of the United States of America, under which we are living, set up by those who framed its constitution, in which we see the hand of God manifest, has made ample provisions for the real conscientious objectors. Again in the present crisis we now also believe that the hand of God is working through the government, in providing a refuge for those who are conscientiously opposed to war.

In order to inform the Brotherhood as to whom the government recognizes to be conscientious objectors, we think a little explanation should be made so that all may obtain that information.

The government recognizes as such only those who are wholly consistent in their claim and life which includes past as well as present behavior and occupation; and this present Standing Committee urgently requests that all elders and others so instruct all our members.

This query with its answers to be placed on the minutes of this Annual Meeting. Accepted by the Annual Meeting.

Infares

1827 ART. 10. Whether we may be allowed to hold infares? Considered, that it (such things) belongs to pride, extravagance, and vanity, and should not be among members.

1912 ART. 3. Will not this Annual Meeting of 1912 confirm the decision of 1871, article 18, which we believe is in harmony with the principles of God's word? Then in view of said principles, is it right on matrimonial occasions or infares at members' houses to have displays as wedding marches, two or more couples selected to stand up on each side of bride and groom at time of ceremony, when seating around the table, then coupling off, two and two, till the table is filled, or any other display to gratify the flesh? Let us have a union in these things, brethren. Answer: We, your sub-committee, find the query in minute book, Art. 18, does not cover this query. But in answer to this we would strongly admonish all our dear members against all unbecoming displays such as floral wreaths, bowers, marches, and all wedding displays of every kind; and instead of all such merriment let the prayerful, solemn feeling prevail. Passed by the meeting.

Installations

1846 ART. 9. Is a brother that was a speaker or deacon, and has moved into another church, properly reinstalled in his office, if an ordained brother takes the counsel of the church, and announces the same to him, without he being received by the members with hand and kiss? Considered unanimously, by the elders, that inasmuch as he was properly received into his office, by the church in which he was chosen, he would be sufficiently established.

1850 ART. 6. A request that the regular order of choosing teachers among the brethren, should be entered at large on the minutes of this Yearly Meeting, so as to counteract wrong impressions, derived from certain publications. Referred to the next Annual Meeting.

1874 **ART. 8 Would it not be proper** for the Annual Meeting to adopt a form, to be used by the elders installing a brother into the first and second degrees of the ministry, so that all ministers would be installed in office by a uniform charge, as is done in regard to installing deacons. Art. 15, in the minutes of 1835? Answer: The elder installing a brother into the first degree of the ministry, should give the following charge: "The duties of the brother elected, while in the first degree of the ministry, are not very onerous. The church authorizes him to exhort and to preach as an assistant to the elder and older ministers, as they may give him liberty to do. It is his duty, however, faithfully to attend the meetings of the church, and when liberty is given, to exhort or preach, and do it humbly, and willingly and faithfully as the Lord will afford him grace to do. But should it happen that none of the older ministering brethren should come to the regular appointment, then it will be his duty, and he is hereby authorized, to conduct the meeting according to the usual order of the brethren, to the best of his ability, and to announce the regular appointments; but he has no authority to make or announce any appointments on his own or private account. In case, however, he is called to preach on a funeral occasion, he is at liberty, and is hereby authorized, to go and conduct the services according to the usual order of the brethren. And it is thought good that the elder and older ministering brethren should be liberal in giving him liberty to preach, and not always confine him to the closing services, or he may not soon learn how to be a workman approved of God, that needs not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth'." The brother's name should now be announced, and he should be called to come forward, and asked, before all, to promise to conform to the general order of the brotherhood in dress and all matters of non-conformity to the world, whether he accepts the position into which the church purposes to place him, and whether he will so submit himself; and if he answers in the affirmative, the brethren will receive him with the right hand of fellowship and kiss of charity, and the sisters with the right hand of fellowship only. And to advance a brother into the second degree of the ministry, the elder giving the charge, may say: "Dear brother [calling his name], the church having called you into the first degree of the ministry, and on trial has confidence in your fidelity and integrity, now proposes to advance you into the second degree, and thereby your labors will be increased and your duties will become more onerous, and will require a greater sacrifice on your part. The church now authorizes you to appoint meetings for preaching, according to the general order of the brethren, to administer the ordinance of baptism, and, in the absence of an elder, to take the counsel of the church on the admission of an applicant for baptism, to serve the communion in the absence of an elder, or at his or their request, if present, to solemnize the right of marriage according to the laws of the state and the usages of the church. In brief, to perform all the duties of an ordained elder, excepting you have no authority to install officers in the church, neither by giving a charge, as I am now doing, nor by laying on hands in ordaining a brother into the full degree of the ministry. You have also no authority to preside in the council-meetings of the church in which official members of the church are to be dealt with. You have no authority to go into the acknowledged territory of any organized church to make appointments for preaching, unless called by the elder or council of said church. It is an assumption of authority for an ordained elder to do so. But let it be understood that while the church now invests you with these rights and privileges, she still holds you to the apostolical injunction: 'Ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder; yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble' (I. Peter v. 5), and will hold you amenable to her councils; and if you manifest an arbitrary self-will and domineering spirit, the same authority which now gives you these privileges, will, if need requires it, suspend you, and take from you all the authority she now gives you." The brother should rise on his feet, and be asked to promise to conform to the general order of the brotherhood in dress and all matters of non-conformity to the world, and whether he accepts this position, and whether he will submit himself; and if he answers in the affirmative, the church should again receive him, as at first, with hand and kiss.

1875 ART. 16. Will not this district-meeting petition the Annual Meeting to modify or change a small portion of the answer to Art. 8, of 1874, where it says: "You have no authority to go into acknowledged territory of any organized church to make appointments for preaching, unless called by the elder or council of said church. It is an assumption of authority for an ordained elder to do so," and not limit them; for the Savior says: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Mark xvi. 15. Answer: We know of no reason why we should make any change, and therefore make none.

1877 ART. 21. Will not this district meeting re-petition the Annual Meeting to reconsider query 8, of 1874, and repeal that portion of the answer of said query where it says, "You have no authority to go into the acknowledged territory of any organized church to make appointments for preaching unless called for by the elders or council of said church; it is an asumption of authority for an ordained elder to do so?" We, the District of West Virginia, grant the above request. Answer: Inasmuch as ministering brethren have abused their liberty in being too ready to go into other congregations, and there preaching and talking in a way that has given trouble and produced confusion in the congregations into which they have gone, we think it best not to make the change asked for. Prudent ministers will have no difficulty from the restrictions.

1877 ART. 31. A request of the district meeting of Eastern Pennsylvania to Annual Meeting, to give an answer to Article 7, 1875, in regard to ordaining elders. Answer: This Annual Meeting gives the following form:

DEAR BROTHER A. B.:—The church having called you to the ministry of the word, and on trial has found you faithful in your calling, she now proposes to advance you to the full ministry by ordaining you an elder, or bishop, by the laying on of hands by the presbytery. In ordaining you an elder, the church gives you all the right and authority belonging to the ministry, such as presiding in council meetings in which official members are tried, at home or abroad, if you are called to do so, in district or Annual Meetings; to give the charge to deacons or ministers, and install them into their respective offices. In short, the church now invests you with all the rights and authority belonging to the eldership, you being equal with all the elders; this phrase, nevertheless, in the apostolic injunction, "Ye younger submit yourselves to the elder," still applies to you, and should you manifest an arbitrary, self-willed, and domineering spirit, the church will hold you subject to her councils, and suspend you, and take from you all the authority she now gives you, and again reduce you to the laity, or even expel you from membership, if necessary.

It will be your duty faithfully to preach the word, and to care for the wants of all the membership, being yourself an example to the church in all holiness and purity of heart, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. It will be your duty in all the affairs of the church to counsel with your official brethren and with the church, taking the oversight not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind, and in no way to lord it over God's heritage. The church will not allow you to depart from the order of the general brotherhood in faith and practice, but will hold you to the faith and practice of the Scriptures as defined by the brethren in Annual Meeting assembled.

Now, dear Brother A. B., do you willingly accept the position into which the church now proposes to put you? And do you, in good faith, without any mental reservation, accept and adopt all the order and practice of the general brotherhood in all her peculiarities, plainness of dress, and non-conformity to the world? And do you promise to unite your labors with all your faithful brethren everywhere, to observe and enforce all the faith and practice of the general brotherhood? The elders will now lay hands on the brother, and pray, and the church will then receive him in the usual order, by the right hand of fellowship and kiss of love. And it will be the duty of the church to honor and respect the brother in the office of bishop, according to the apostolic instruction, and to aid him in observing all the faith and order of the general brotherhood.

(Recon. Min.)
1884 Sec. 37—ORDAINING ELDERS. We adopt the decisions of Article 41, 1865, and disapprove of Article 28, 1856, and ask for a reprint upon these minutes as the form found in minutes of 1877, Article 31.

NOTE.—Accepted by this meeting, with an amendment of the last line in second paragraph, where it reads, "as defined by the brethren in Annual Meeting assembled," to read thus: "As defined and handed down by our faithful forefathers of the church;" and also in the third paragraph, fourth line, omit the clause "Without any mental reservation."—CLERK.

1901 ART. 4. If an official brother marries a sister in the laity, and she is to be put in office with her husband, should the elders present have the work done without counseling the church, or should the church be counseled in the matter? As it has been done both ways, to the dissatisfaction of brethren, we ask the Annual Meeting of 1901 to set forth one order, that we may work together in union. Answer: We think that all such work should be done by the counsel of the church, instead of by the elders alone; for the power is in the church, according to the Gospel. See Matt. 16, 18, 19; also A. M. 1849, Art. 9.

Insurance

1847 ART. 11. Is it proper for brethren to have their property insured by an insurance company? Considered, that we can not advise brethren to do so, neither could we forbid its being done, in a mutual way.

1856 ART. 2. Is it proper for brethren to have their property insured by insurance companies? Considered, to leave it as the brethren made it in 1847 (Art. 11), but we would, in addition, advise all brethren not to unite or bind themselves with or to any company or society of this world.

1864 ART. 3. Is it right, according to the tenor of the gospel, for brethren to erect lightning rods upon their buildings, and to have their property and lives insured? Answer: As to lightning rods, we fully agree with the answer given by the Yearly Meeting of 1851, Article 7: "Considered, that we would not advise brethren to do so, nor would we say to those who have them, to take them down, but advise all our dear brethren to bear with each other in such matters, and to try to put their chief trust in God." We likewise agree with the Annual Meeting of 1847, concerning the insurance of property: "Considered, that we can not advise brethren to do so, neither could we forbid its being done in a mutual way." But as to getting their lives insured, we advise the brethren to make use of no such privilege.

1865 ART. 45. What is the difference (if there is any difference) for brethren to have their property insured, or to have their lives insured, as it appears from Art. 3, of the minutes of 1864, that there is quite a difference? Answer: We think there is quite a difference, since we do not think it right to put a money value upon human life, while he may on property.

1869 ART.16. Inasmuch as there is great dissatisfaction as regards the decision of the Annual Meeting relating to insurance, in permitting brethren to insure property but not life, and thus permitting the rich who own real estate to insure, but not the poor, should not a poor man be permitted to insure his life as well as the rich his property? Answer: We defer this subject for the present.

1870 ART. 4. We desire an answer to Art. 16 of last Annual Meeting. This article is as follows: Inasmuch as there is great dissatisfaction as regards the decision of the Annual Meeting, relating to insurance, in permitting brethren to insure property but not life, and thus permitting the rich who own real estate to insure, but not the poor, should not a poor man be permitted to insure his life as well as the rich his property? Considered, that we postpone this question.

1871 ART. 12. Does the gospel teach that the brethren are (by the gospel) to aid one another in case of loss; and if so, ought they not to establish their own insurance companies, and not insure in those of the world? Answer: We conclude to defer this question until our next Annual Meeting.

1871 ART.19. **How is it considered** for members of the church to attach themselves to the Washington Mutual Live Stock Insurance Company? Answer: We consider that brethren should not join any society by which they jeopardise their non-resistant principles.

1873 ART. 1. Is it consistent for brethren to have their lives insured? And how shall we proceed with those brethren who have their lives insured? Answer: It is inconsistent for brethren to do so.

1875 ART. 22. Is it right, or according to the gospel, for brethren to have their property insured? Answer: We can not see that it is wrong to do so, if done in a mutual way. (See Art. 3, Minutes of 1864.)

1879 ART. 15. Is it considered right and according to the gospel and the old established order of the Brethren to organize a mutual fire insurance company? Answer: It is neither contrary to the gospel nor the principles of the Brethren, provided the charter, if there is one, does not require the brethren to compromise any of our principles.

1882 ART. 10. Is it against the order of the Old German Baptist Church for brethren to insure their property? If so, how is it with those who had their property insured before the separation? The district meeting submits the above to the Annual Meeting. Answer: The brethren can not recommend our members to have their property insured; but we very strongly urge all our members to be very free and charitable in helping any of our dear members who may be unfortunate by fire or otherwise.

(Recon. Min.)
1883 SEC. 9. INSURANCE. All former minutes repudiated Endorse minutes of 1882, Art. 10. (Accepted) No encouragement to take part in fire or life insurance, contrary to our faith in the word of God, and of the old fathers, who admonished us not to follow the ways of this world. [See I. John ii. 15.]

1898 ART. 1. Is it right for brethren to act as insurance agents? Answer: Inasmuch as we think that former minutes of Annual Meetings give us safe counsel as touching insurance, and as we think that our brethren should respect the decisions of the Annual Meetings, we think it wrong according to the spirit of the Gospel for brethren to act in the capacity of insurance agents. See Romans 14. 22. "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in the thing which he alloweth."

1905 ART. 2. To the Annual Meeting of 1905, assembled:

Inasmuch as many of our dear members have their property insured in various institutions of the world; and many say, if the brethren would make it obligatory on our church officials to look after all of our dear members' losses, either by fire or cyclone, and make up two-thirds or three-fourths of their losses, they would get out of these institutions. Therefore, could not this Annual Meeting adopt the above, and have our officials to look after the adjusting of said losses, and meet the expenses of said losses on the same plan as our Annual Meeting expenses are met, and thereby stop our dear members from taking out insurance policies? However, if any of our dear members will not withdraw from these worldly institutions they will not come within reach of this query. Answer: Whereas this query or request does not carry with it any equitable plan for the assessing and collecting of means, this Annual Meeting simply asks a more liberal and brotherly application of Art. 10 of Minutes of Annual Meeting of the year 1882.

1926 ART. 2. Inasmuch as some of our dear brethren are insuring their lives to the dissatisfaction of many of our dear members, we therefore pray our A. M. to give us a more definite answer to life insurance: Answer. We unanimously agree that it is not according to the Spirit of the Gospel for brethren to have their lives insured.

1928 ART. 3. We have an applicant for baptism who took out a life insurance policy for 20 years, 16 years ago, and has paid out on it $1515 and has borrowed $850 on a note and gave the policy as security on the note. Now upon his promise not to take out any more policies, we ask this Annual Meeting to tell us if the Scriptures will justify us under the foregoing conditions and the minutes we already have, to receive and baptize him, and bear with him to still comply with the conditions of the policy till due or lose all, and thereby favor him to receive the policy money when due and also pay the note secured by the policy. We pray this A. M. to give us a definite answer what to do under the foregoing conditions. Answer: We unitedly agree to send this query back to the congregation to dispose of according to their good judgment and the benefit of all concerned. Passed and let the local church act on its own responsibility.

1933 ART. 6. Inasmuch as there is a difference of opinion on insurance, some saying that one kind of insurance is all right for members to have, and another kind is very wrong, while some others claim that all forms of insurance are wrong, will not this Annual Meeting state plainly how our beloved brotherhood interprets the minutes we have on insurance?

Answer: We do not think that we can do any better than to refer to the minutes on insurance adopted in 1882 and later. See minutes of 1882, Art. 10; Reconsidered minutes 1883, Sec. 9; 1926, Art. 2. Passed .

Interest

1783 ART. 2. Concerning taking interest, it is considered that no member should take interest for his money, inasmuch in the law of God it was expressly forbidden, and Christ says that the Scripture can not be broken (John x. 35); and inasmuch the dear and chosen vessel and faithful apostle, Paul, says that Christ became the end of the law, and yet the word of God, and also divine knowledge teaches that in order to become partakers of Christ it is required to deny ourselves entirely of all those things which are contrary to the word and command of God; therefore, we exhort again heartily and unitedly, that such members who might be involved in this point should think of better things, and have more regard and respect for their denied Lord Jesus and His truth, and wish them faith and the grace of God heartily.

1822 ART. 12. Whether it be right for a follower of Jesus to take interest, was considered, that neither the law nor the gospel gives us such privilege, and that it should not be among the membership.

1834 ART. 3. Whether we may take interest from a brother? Considered somewhat differently, but our (charity) moderation should be known, and we should be willing to lend to the poor without interest.

1835 ART. 3. Concerning taking interest. Considered not allowed by the gospel, and brethren should beware of usury (unlawful interest) especially.

1837 ART. 9. How it is considered if members take more than lawful interest? Considered, that it ought to be by no means; and if a brother should do so, he ought to be visited, and if he would not take advice, we could not be satisfied with him.

1845 ART. 4. In regard to usury and increase, it was considered, that as it was against the law of Moses, and could not be otherwise than against the gospel of Christ, which commands us "to lend where we hope for nothing again," we should be very careful not to ask or take more than lawful interest, and keep an open hand for the poor, to lend them even without interest.

1850 ART. 20. Is a member, brother or sister, not as justifiable in buying lottery tickets as in purchasing bank stock, or taking eight or ten per cent. interest on money loaned to a brother? Considered, that buying lottery tickets is very wrong; taking more than lawful interest is worse still, and taking stock in a bank ought to be avoided, also, by brethren. (One wrong can never justify another.)

1856 ART. 1. What is to be done, according to the gospel, with brethren who take more than lawful interest, and are not willing to be subject to the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1826? The gospel directs the subjects of Christ's kingdom to be subject to the laws of the land; therefore no brother should take more than the law allows. If he does, he should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii., and required to restore what has been taken unlawfully.

1862 ART. 61. Is it consistent with the gospel, and the order of the brethren, for wealthy brethren to make it a rule or custom, when they lend money to poor brethren or others, to make those who borrow the money pay the tax on the money, when they receive interest on the money? If not consistent with the gospel, what is to be done with such a brother? Answer: We think it is not consistent with the gospel to take more than lawful interest. (See Luke iii. 13.) We think such a brother should be admonished by the church, and if he will not hear the church, he should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1863 ART. 9. If one brother should demand and receive more interest from another brother than the law allows, and the latter acquiesces for years, but finally becomes dissatisfied, must he make the complaint to the church, or commence in the ordinary way, by going first privately to the offending brother, etc.? Answer: The dissatisfied brother should proceed according to Matt. xviii., and the offending brother should refund the unlawful interest as far as the church in which both reside may judge equitable.

1872 ART. 11. What is to be done with a district of the church that tolerates its members in taking illegal interest for money loaned, after the Annual Meeting has decided again and again that it is wrong to do so? Answer: This Annual Meeting thinks that church should be visited by the elders of the adjoining churches, to set in order the things that are wanting.

1873 ART. 23. Inasmuch as Art. 11, of 1872, is not heeded, will not the Annual Meeting devise some plan to have it enforced throughout the whole brotherhood? Answer: In case a church permits its members to take illegal interest in opposition to the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1872, Art. 11, the aggrieved members may apply to the Annual Meeting for a committee.

(Recon. Min.)
1883 SEC. 7. UNLAWFUL INTEREST. All minutes retained. We accept the resolutions. The poor must be cared for by alms-giving, no unlawful interest taken from any one. [See minutes of 1837, Art. 9; 1845, Art. 4.] (Accepted.)

Jewelry

1853 ART. 8. How shall we proceed, in case we have a love-feast, and a sister, or sisters, come from another congregation to our love-feast, who wear ear-rings or jewels; whether we have a right to take them in council, and, if not willing to lay them off, whether we are privileged to keep them from the communion-table? The committee was decidedly of opinion that as it is positively forbidden by Holy Writ (see I. Peter iii. 3; I. Tim. ii. 9), it should not be tolerated, except in cases of actual necessity; and that the church, where such members propose to participate in the communion, has the right to take them into council, and if they are not willing to be admonished, to advise them to withdraw till they are willing to sacrifice those forbidden things.

1864 ART. 7. When the apostles prohibit the wearing of gold and pearls (I. Tim. ii. 9; I. Peter iii. 3), are gold watches to be included? Answer: As the carrying of gold watches may, and is likely to, lead to pride, we think it advisable not to wear them.

Juries

1822 ART. 2. Whether a brother might serve in a worldly office or as a juryman, was considered, that no follower of Jesus can serve in such, and if he could get relieved with money (by paying a fine), he should not serve herein.

1832 ART. 1. How is it considered if a brother serves on a grand jury, and bears testimony against a brother, by which the latter is caused to suffer costs, and the testimony is not given from necessity or duty, but from want of love? Considered, that serving on juries was ever deemed improper for brethren; but in this special case the church where it occurred, and who should know and weigh all the circumstances, should judge according to the law of Christ, according to the testimony.

1834 ART. 11. Whether a brother can serve on a jury, where a man is tried for his life (as a murderer)? Considered, no, it can not be at all.

1835 ART. 17. Concerning serving on juries at trials for life or death? Answered as before.

1841 ART. 11. Whether it is becoming for a member of the church of Christ to act as a juror in the courts of our country? Considered that it would be best not to serve at all even in civil, but by no means in criminal cases.

1864 ART. 6. Have the brethren a gospel-right to serve as jurors when the authorities call for them? Answer: No; as we are admonished by the apostle (II Cor. vi. 14-18.)

1866 ART. 45. We ask this Annual Meeting to reconsider Art. 6, of 1864, and, if not changed, to give a more scriptural reason why brethren should not serve as jurors. Answer: We advise our brethren not to serve as jurors when they can avoid it.

1875 ART. 32. Is it understood that the decisions of the Annual Meeting, as heretofore given, against brethren serving as jurors in the courts of our country, apply to serving as grand jurors, whose duty is only to find a bill against the party to be tried in law, or are they to apply only against serving as a petit juror, whose duty is to find a verdict in the trial? Answer: They are considered to apply to both juries.

Kiss, The Holy

1797 ART. 3. It was in union concluded, that the holy kiss and the kiss of charity should not be neglected, since in some places it is almost entirely omitted; but according to the words of the apostles, we should prove ourselves on all occasions as disciples of Jesus, and be steadfast in brotherly love; and notwithstanding all disgrace, we should not be ashamed of the word and following of Christ.

1810 ART. 3. Concerning when brethren or members get at variance or in difficulty with one another, no one is allowed to refuse to the other the kiss for himself, without counsel of the church, unless there had been committed an obvious crime.

1810 ART. 4. Concerning when a member has been put back from the communion, and some from kindness or relationship continue to salute such with the holy kiss, before they are received again by the church, it was considered as a fault, and should be by no means.

1828 ART. 8 Whether the holy kiss should be observed at feet-washing and the breaking of bread? Considered, that it is right and proper.

1831 ART. 2. Whether it could be approved of when the brotherly kiss is so often omitted, even at meetings and love-feasts? Considered, no, not at all.

1832 ART. 4. Concerning the omitting of the holy kiss among members. Considered, that it should not be, and that it is an evidence of a want of love.

1835 ART. 19. How is it considered, when members wash the feet or salute with the holy kiss those who are not members of the church? Considered, we should not do so, if it gives offense.

1843 ART. 2. Whether a brother may refuse the kiss to a brother who hath committed a fault—for instance, getting intoxicated—ere he has been brought and judged before the council of the church? Considered, that though a member could not be required to salute a brother with the kiss while in a state of intoxication, it is still our duty, first to tell the fault unto the church, and to await its decision, before we withdraw ourselves from a member.

1845 ART. 14. Whether a brother has a right to withdraw the kiss from a brother without the decision of the church? Considered, that inasmuch as our Savior directs us in a case of offense to use all means to **gain** our brother (see Matt. xviii.), the gospel allows no brother to withdraw the kiss until the church has so decided.

1849 ART. 4. Concerning the holy kiss, how often should it be practiced? Considered, if we have love for one another we should not dispense with it, especially at our meetings for worship.

1851 ART. 22. How do the brethren, in general, pass the kiss at the communion-table? Is it to the brother who sits at the administrator's right or left? Considered, that we see no difference; but leave it to the administrator, as he sees proper, or as circumstances will admit.

1852 ART. 24. Have we a right to refuse the salutation of the holy kiss to a brother that is intoxicated with strong drink, or to one that is unclean by the intemperate use of tobacco? Considered, that no brother could be censured if he refuses to salute a brother intoxicated, or unclean with using tobacco or strong drink.

1853 ART. 39. Would it not be more consistent with the gospel, and the practice of the apostles, to extend the kiss, termed the holy kiss and the kiss of charity, to each other only when coming together and separating from each other, and not at feet-washing and the communion; or did our Lord and Master indeed institute such a thing in that night in which he was betrayed? Considered, that we feel perfect liberty in the gospel, to continue as we always heretofore have done.

1856 ART. 27. Does Christian fellowship, according to the gospel, forbid, or require, or leave it optional for brethren, when meeting in cities, towns, or at public gatherings, when extending the salutation of the hand, to accompany the same with the salutation of the holy kiss? Considered, optional.

1857 ART. 29. The Marsh Creek Church, in Adams County, Pennsylvania, requests a reconsideration of Art. 39, of the minutes of 1853, relating to the salutation of the kiss, at baptism, the communion, and at ordinations. Answer: It is neither expedient, nor desirable, to make any change in the aforesaid article of the minutes.

1859 ART. 31. Is it according to the gospel and its principles for brethren of our fraternity to salute with the holy kiss those who do not stand in the faith with us, nor practice or keep the ordinances of the Lord as we do? And is it according to the gospel to call such brethren, and give them liberty to take part in our public worship? Answer: As a general thing we do not think it is expedient to do so.

1864 ART. 27. Is it right for members of our church to meet members of other denominations, with hand and kiss, the same as we meet our own members? Answer: We think it not right to salute them as members.

1869 ART. 3. Would it not be more in accordance with the Scriptures, and the example of the Savior, to dispense with the salutation of the kiss at feet-washing, and at the communion? Answer: We readopt the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1853, Art. 39.

1871 ART. 8. Will the district-meeting petition the Annual Meeting to reconsider and revoke Art. 27, of the minutes of the Annual Meeting, passed A. D. 1856, relative to the holy kiss? Answer: This Annual Meeting thinks it best to make no change of Art. 27, of 1856.

Know-Nothing Party

1855 ART. 3. How is it considered, if a brother, or brethren, belong to the party so-called "Know-Nothings," and take an active part in it, trying to persuade brethren to join said party? Considered, that no brother, who is a member of the so-called Know-Nothings, or any other secret society, can be a member of our communion.

Labor Unions

1941 ART. 2. Inasmuch as some of our dear members are affiliating themselves with the Labor Unions which exist in the United States of America, and by so doing are placing themselves in a position in which they will have to cooperate with a group of individuals which uses coercive means to an extent which often leads to bloodshed and brutal exercise in order to force their claims, and also doing things in secret which have always been prohibited by the Word of God and the Church, we believe that such an act by our brethren is strictly against the faith of the Old German Baptist Church and will possibly lead us unguarded into the Mark of the Beast, as spoken of by the "Revealtor" John.

We believe also that such an act is parallel with, if not much worse than affiliating with secret orders which our Brotherhood has already disapproved. See Minutes of A. M. Art. 40, 1866; Art. 6, 1869.

Will this A. M. of 1941 say what course of procedure shall be taken with members who affiliate themselves with such unions?

Answer: We feel that according to Annual Meeting minutes and the spirit and tenor of the Gospel and the practice and usage of our brethren, that any member affiliating in the things mentioned in the above query, should be dealt with as a transgressor. See Minutes of A. M., Art. 3, 1855; Art. 4, 1859. Passed by the Meeting.

Languages, Using Different Languages At Meetings

1841 ART. 4. Whether it is proper for teachers to speak both German and English in meetings, when there are only a few English members, the majority of the church being German? Considered, that it is right, and our duty, to preach the gospel to every nation as far as we are able, yet so that in such a case not too much time ought to be taken up in English.

1845 ART. 15. How is it viewed, when there are persons and members in a meeting, some not understanding the English, and others not the German (language), and there are some members still opposing the use of both languages? Considered, that the commission of our Savior (Matt. xxviii. 19) commands us, and the love of Christ constrains us (II. Cor. v. 14), to preach the gospel to **all** nations, and in every tongue, as far as we are able.

Law

1822 ART. 4. Whether it is right for a brother to take the benefit of the law, was considered, that when a brother is so imprudent that he falls under the power of the law, he is not to have privilege to take the benefit of the law, but to seek counsel from the church. Yet it would be always best to seek counsel before a member comes so far.

1840 ART. 6. Whether a brother may take the liberty in a civil lawsuit as defendant to answer for himself or by an attorney, and in case he should consider himself wronged in the first instance, whether he is justified to appeal further? Considered, that a brother, if he is summoned before a magistrate, may state his case, but before he would go any further he ought to ask the counsel of the church, which will be agreeable with the gospel.

1841 ART. 5. Whether a brother, consistently with the gospel, can take the benefit of the law for insolvent debtors? Considered, that there may be cases where the involving at first and the consequences thereupon are not at all compatible with the gospel, and where the church could not hold such as brethren; and that there may be cases where a brother, by misfortune, may be brought to such extremity, and if he were honest in his declaration, his application for the benefit of the law might even be excusable. In all such cases, however, the church has to investigate the matter, and judge accordingly, and if the church is at a loss, to call in, as in other cases, the assistance of the elders from other churches.

1849 ART. 28. Whether a brother, who considers himself injured by any public improvement, such as a turnpike, or railroad, passing through his land, can, without a violation of the gospel, make use of the provision of the law, which the Government has enacted for the recovery of damages in such cases? Considered, as the matter has been fully stated, that it would not be a violation of the gospel to make use of the provisions of the law in such cases.

1851 ART. 24. With regard to the twenty-eighth query, in 1849, a more definite answer is required, how far a brother may go, in order to recover indemnification for losses sustained from a railroad, turnpike, and the like, passing through his land. Considered, that we might use the provision of the law; that is, petition the court for what it will make, as damages, but should use no violence, by putting the law in force, for a recompense.

1854 ART. 23. A request to reconsider query 3 on the Minutes of 1852, which reads thus: "Have we a right to help make the political government, and to serve as officers; also to put the law in force against any of our fellow-men in any case whatever? Considered, that this query was sufficiently and correctly answered in 1852. (See Rom. vi. 16, x. 1-3; II. Pet. i. 19, ii. 19; I. John iii. 8, 9; Matt. vi. 24; II. Cor. vi. 5-8! John xviii. 36.)

1856 ART. 12. If a brother is sued by a member of the world, may he appear and show his cause? If so, how far may he proceed with the law? Considered, that he may; but if judgment is given against him, he should proceed no further.

1856 ART. 13. If a brother is sued for an unpaid debt, and it being out of his power to attend, yet judgment is given against him, may he take an appeal to court for a greater or less amount? Considered, that in such cases brethren have a right to a hearing to bring matters to light; yet in all such cases brethren should ask counsel of the church to avoid difficulties to which they might subject themselves by taking their own course.

1857 ART. 16. Inasmuch as it is considered, by the brethren, that we have no right, according to the gospel, to use the law in collecting debts, or to sue at law, would not a brother who has done so, or may do so, fall into the judgment of the church? Answer: This subject has frequently been discussed in our Annual Meetings, and we can not, we think, come to a better conclusion than our dear brethren came to in 1852; and as no brother should be his own judge in this matter, the brethren, very wisely, added the proviso, that in all cases the church should be consulted, and if the council is disregarded, those who disregard it will fall into the judgment of the church.

1858 ART. 20. Is it right, according to the gospel, to enenforce the law in any case whatever, and if so, where is the gospel authority? Concluded to adopt the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1857. (This subject has frequently been discussed in our Annual Meetings, and we can not, we think, come to a better conclusion than our dear brethren came to in 1852; and as no brother should be his own judge in this matter, the brethren, very wisely, added the proviso, that, in all cases, the church should be consulted, and if its counsel is disregarded, those who disregard it will fall into the judgment of the church. Minutes of 1857, Art. 16.)

1859 ART. 1. How is it considered if an elder gets in debt, and is sued, and is compelled to take the stay-law in order to get time to make arrangements to pay the claim, and pays it according to the time prescribed by law? Answer: We consider that he could do no better under such circumstances .

1859 ART. 12. Is it wrong for one brother to take a note of another brother? And is it wrong for the holder of the note to exchange it for a piece of land, after it was due (three years), by withholding the collection of the note for the time specified by the giver of the note? And is it wrong to ask a mortgage to secure such a note, where the giver mortgages all his property out of his hands? Answer: We do not consider it wrong. This answer is designed for each of the above questions.

1859 ART. 26. Does the gospel, in any case, allow a member of the church to use the power of the law in collecting a debt, or in defense of his rights? And if going to law is wrong, does the sanction of the church make it right? We also desire queries thirty-two and forty-nine of the minutes of 1858, to be reconsidered by this Annual Meeting. Answer: We can not give our members liberty to go to law; and if any of them do go to law, the congregation in which such reside shall take the case up and act on it as it thinks the gospel requires. This answer, it was thought, is sufficient for the whole query, as the different points in it refer to the same general subject.

1859 ART. 13. Is it right for a member of the church to have his property set off, where the law allows a certain amount, say three hundred dollars? Answer: We think it is not right.

1860 ART. 3. What is to be done with the following case: A brother buys real estate, and becomes much involved in debt by borrowing money, and otherwise, and then, to secure some one or two of his creditors, mortgages all of his real estate to them. He afterward appoints a trustee to sell his property, which does not cover the liens against it, and the wife, who is a sister, takes from the trustee a portion of the personal property, in consideration of her relinquishing her potential right of dower, while much money will be lost by the creditors? Answer: If the church in which the case exists is satisfied that there was no intention to defraud, on the part of the brother, and that the sister, by taking the personal property, as stated, was an advantage, rather than a disadvantage, in the sale of the real estate, it may retain them as members under a satisfactory acknowledgment.

1863 ART. 14. How is it considered concerning a brother in the following case: A certain man, not a member of our church, forges a note to the amount of three hundred and seventy-five dollars against said brother, and a summons is issued and served by the sheriff for this (false) debt against him? In consequence of this, the brother testifies against the forger before a court of justice, who is convicted, and sentenced to the state prison for a term of years? Considered, that the brother should have first taken counsel of the church.

1869 ART. 5. How is it considered by the brethren, for a brother to take the benefit of the bankrupt law? Answer: Considered not according to gospel. Matt. v. 40; Luke xvi. 9, 10.

1869 ART. 7. Can a brother, consistently with the gospel, take the benefit of the law by getting up a peition to locate a ditch according to law, and thus compel others to ditch? Answer: We consider it most in accordance with the gospel, and the general principles of the brotherhood, not to use the law to compel men to do any thing.

1876 ART. 19. Is it right, according to the gospel, for a brother to plead the laws of the land, and act as an attorney? Answer: The brethren have always considered it not according to the gospel for a brother to practice law and act as an attorney, and we make no change in this respect.

Release of Convicts

1893 ART. 3. Inasmuch as we are sometimes solicited to sign petitions for the release of persons who have been convicted of crime, and are held by the law as convicts in our state prisons, we ask the counsel of this meeting, whether members should sign such instruments or writings. Answer: We deem it not safe to meddle with cases above referred to, for if the law of our land is violated we should not interfere, according to I Tim. i. 9, 10.

Law, Using Against Debtors

1810 ART. 2. Concerning who use the law for collecting debts, it was considered, that it is unbecoming for brethren to do so, that it can not be permitted, and if they should do such a disallowed thing, they are to be left over to the counsel of the church.

1821 ART. 1. Whether an ordained brother may collect debts by the power of the law? Considered, that no brother, much less one that is ordained, has a right to do so according to gospel doctrine, neither for himself nor for another.

1833 ART. 2. Whether there is any difference in using the law for our own benefit or only as executors or administrators? Considered, there is none in reality; it is wrong for ourselves, it is wrong if we do it for others.

1834 ART. 7. How is it viewed when a ministering brother, as executor or administrator of an estate, is compelled to use the law? Considered, he should do nothing without the counsel of the church.

1842 ART. 11. Whether it be allowable for brethren to collect debts by force of law, and what is to be done with a brother who uses the power of the law, and justifies himself in the same? Considered, as always was done by the brethren, that we have no right according to the gospel to use the rigor of the law in collecting debts, and that a brother who has done so falls into the judgment of the church.

1844 ART. 6. Whether it be allowable for brethren to collect debts by force of law, it was again considered that no brother has any right, in the gospel, to sue at law. Luke iii. 14; Matt. v. 38, etc., vi. 12, etc.

(Special)

1848 ART. 9. Whether brethren can, according to the gospel, use the force of the law and collect money from brethren, and thereby cause considerable costs; and whether brethren, causing such costs, should not at least pay the same? Considered, that the gospel gives no right to use the force of the law against a brother; and as to the other point, in regard to the costs, the church can judge best in each individual case.

(Special)

1848 ART. 4. How would it be considered, if a man be put in the county prison for safe keeping until court, and a brother goes his security for appearance, and releases him out of prison? Considered, that a brother ought not to meddle with such matters without church counsel.

1852 ART. 3. Have we a right to help make the political government, and to serve as officers, also, to put the law in force against any of our fellow-men, in any case whatever? Considered, that the brethren should be careful and not betray their profession in helping to make and serve the civil government, and, if they give in their vote, they should do it in a quiet and peaceful manner, without taking part in electioneering, and return immediately from the ground; that brethren should hold no office under the civil government that would cause them to betray their faith; and as respects using the law against our fellow creatures, brethren should use lenity and Christian forbearance toward our fellow-men, and not compel them by the law, unless prompted so to do by stern necessity. But before so doing they should always take the counsel of the church.

1853 ART. 16. Concerning going to law. Considered, that it should be left as it was decided last year. (See Minutes of 1852, Art. 3.)

1853 ART. 32. When an ordained brother sues, or causes to be sued, a brother in an adjoining church, where is the case to be investigated? Considered, that it is to be investigated in the church where the ordained brother lives.

1853 ART. 34. How is it considered when a brother goes to law, in order to collect money due to him, and other brethren justify him in it, and even speakers can see no wrong in it, and are opposed to having it brought before the church? Considered, that it is not in accordance with the gospel to make use of the law to collect money, and that it is wrong for brethren to justify it, and still more wrong for speakers to oppose its being brought before the church.

1857 **ART. 16. Inasmuch as it is considered,** by the brethren, that we have no right, according to the gospel, to use the law in collecting debts, or to sue at law, would not a brother who has done so, or may do so, fall into the judgment of the church? Answer: This subject has frequently been discussed in our Annual Meetings, and we can not, we think, come to a better conclusion than our dear brethren came to in 1852; and as no brother should be his own judge in this matter, the brethren, very wisely, added the proviso, that in all cases the church should be consulted, and if the council is disregarded, those who disregard it will fall into the judgment of the church.

1858 ART. 20. Is it right, according to the gospel, to enforce the law in any case whatever, and if so, where is the gospel authority? Concluded to adopt the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1857. (This subject has frequently been discussed in our Annual Meetings, and we can not, we think, come to a better conclusion than our dear brethren came to in 1852; and as no brother should be his own judge in this matter, the brethren, very wisely, added the proviso, that, in all cases, the church should be consulted, and if its counsel is disregarded, those who disregard it will fall into the judgment of the church. Minutes of 1857, Art. 16.)

1858 ART. 30. How is it considered if a brother has a note against another poor brother, who can not pay, and the brother who has the note sells it to his son, who is not a member of the church, and he collects the debt by law, and causes the poor brother's property to be sold, the brother who sold the note justifying himself in doing as he did; what is to be done in such a case? Considered, that the brother who did so, committed a great fault, and that he should make restitution to the poor brother to the satisfaction of the church.

1858 ART. 32. If any man be in Christ, and Christ in him, can he institute and prosecute a process in law against any person, and he all the time still continue in Christ, and Christ in him? Considered, that he can not, especially if gone into without the counsel of the church in which he lives.

1858 ART. 43. How is it considered if an individual moves out the fence of a brother's field, and the brother sends the sheriff and brings a suit of trespass; his case is brought before the church, and one bishop, with the teachers and deacons and other members, decide that the brother has done wrong, but the oldest bishop, with the other members, say that he had no other way to do, and when the voice was taken there was an equal number approving and disapproving the brother's course? Considered, that no member, or members, has a right to put the law in force against his fellow-man, without first taking counsel of the church.

1858 ART. 49. A brother buys a farm that is sold by executors, who are not members of the church, and fails to make payment according to contract, the heirs being members of the church, who, after waiting a long time and being in great need of the money, and living over one hundred miles distant from the brother who bought the farm, receive a letter from him statitng that he will pay them $500, if they will throw off the interest. The heirs, being unwilling to do so, send word to their executors to collect the money by law. Are the heirs now under obligation to pay the cost of collection? Considered, that they are not under such obligation.

1862 ART. 62. Has a brother the right to put the law in force against his brother, to collect money, in any shape or form whatever, without giving him notice before? Answer: In no case whatever.

1863 ART. 2. How is it considered if a brother goes to law with an outsider, without the counsel of the church, and causes quite a conspicuous lawsuit; how are we to deal with such an one according to the gospel? Are we to visit him, according to Matt. xviii., or bring the case before the church at once? Bring it before the church at once.

1867 ART. 24. What is the established usage of the church in the use of the civil law in collecting debts, etc.? Is it altogether forbidden? If not, what is the extent of the privilege? If it is, can it be allowed for members, and especially ministers, to advise persons to sue, and publish a notice to their creditors that if their bonds are not paid when due they will be coerced by law? Answer: We consider it is contrary to the gospel, as understood by the brethren, to use the civil law in collecting debts, or in any other case where it would involve strife or litigation. Friendly suits are admitted, when the case is decided to be such by the council of the church. But to advise others to sue, or to publish that we will sue, is inconsistent with our principles, and would subject a brother to the judgment of the church, according to the gospel. (See Matt. v. 40; Luke vi. 29.)

Laying Out Towns

1854 ART. 2. Whether it is contrary to the gospel for brethren to lay out towns? Considered, that it is not, but that we would at the same time caution our brethren against all schemes of extravagant speculation.

Lecturing on Temperance

1842 ART. 7. Whether it be right for a brother to deliver a lecture on temperance, if requested? Considered, as our commission is to preach the gospel, that we should do so and inculcate temperance as well as other virtues; but to hold lectures on the subject of temperance exclusively was considered not to be advisable for a brother.

Letters of Greeting

1901 ART. 2. Will this Annual Meeting consider the propriety of reading letters of greeting in connection with the opening of exercises of the meeting, rather than at the close? Answer: This Yearly Meeting sees the propriety, from a Gospel standpoint, of reading the letters of greeting in the beginning of the business of the meeting.

Legacies, The Garber Legacy

1851 ART. 25. How shall the brethren at Beaver Dam, Maryland proceed with the money willed by Bro. John Garber, deceased, to be distributed among the various churches that have need in the different states? It is the advice of the assembled brethren, that Bro. Daniel P. Sayler (his address is Middleburg, Carroll County, Maryland) be appointed a general corresponding agent, George Hoke and John P. Ebersole, agents for the north part, and Peter Nead and John Brower, for the south part of Ohio; Abraham Moss for the south, and Jacob Miller, of St. Joseph, for the north part of Indiana; Joseph Emmert for Illinois, and adjacent states; Benj. Bowman for the north, and Abraham Neff for the south parts of Virginia, Carolina, and Tennessee; Jac. Meyer of Somerset, for western Pennsylvania; Andrew Spanogle for the part of Pennsylvania, east of the Alleghany and west of Susquehanna; and Christ Langenecker for Pennsylvania, east of Susquehanna and New Jersey, to report to Daniel P. Sayler, as soon as convenient, the number of churches, and where situated, who are the elders of them, and where there is help necessary. It is further our advice that the above brethren shall report to the committee of the Annual Meeting, every year, how much of said money, and where it was distributed.

1854 ART. 4. Bro. Samuel Lehman was nominated as agent for the Garber legacy in northern Illinois, in place of Joseph Emmert, resigned. Approved.

1856 ART. 33. By request of Bro. George Hoke, who wishes to resign his agency of the Garber charity fund, it was concluded that Bro. Elias Dicky should take charge of the same.

The Karn Legacy

1876 ART. 28. Inasmuch as there has been a certain legacy bequeathed to the standing committee of the German Baptist Church by the last will and testament of Solomon G. Karn; and inasmuch as said money was bequeathed on certain specified conditions, we here give the last will and testament by which said bequest is made to the standing committee of the German Baptist Church:

"Know all men by these presents, that I, Solomon G. Karn, of the County of Wabash, and State of Indiana, being of sound mind, do make and publish this, my last will and testament.

"First: I give and bequeath to my beloved wife, Martha L. Karn, lots Nos. 49 and 50, in the town of Manchester in said county and state, and now occupied by us as our home; also, a certain tract of land in Douglas County, and State of Kansas, belonging to me, and for which I am entitled to a deed, to have as her own, or convey by deed in fee simple, as she may choose; also, all and every article of personal property in our possession, including my mare, buggy and harness, and four hundred dollars, to be paid to her as soon as it can be collected from my outstanding claims.

"I will, further, that my wife shall have the selection of my tombstones, and that my executor pay for them out of the residue of my estate, together with any expense they may apply to my grave.

"Second: It is hereby expressly provided, that should there hereafter an heir be born to me, the residue of my moneys and effects (after the payment of my debts) shall be placed at interest, to the best advantage, for the benefit of said heir, when arriving at majority, but the interest of said money shall be paid annually to my wife, and be subject to her control during her natural life.

"In the event said posthumous child should die before my wife, the interest shall still be paid to my wife, as [and] in the event that my wife and said child should both die before the child becomes of age of majority, then the remainder of estate shall be paid to the standing committee of the first annual conference of the German Baptist Church (of which I am a member), to be used by said committee for the spread of the gospel, or for the purpose of charity, as they shall think right and proper.

"If at any time, by misfortune or illness, the interest, as above, should prove insufficient for the support of my wife, as provided, she shall have of the principal to meet expenditures.

"Third: I do hereby nominate and appoint John Bussard, of Miami County, Indiana, executor of this my last will and testament. I do hereby revoke all former wills by me made.

"In testimony hereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal, this 12th day of November, A. D. 1868.

"SOLOMON G. KARN [Seal]"

"Signed and acknowledged by said Solomon G. Karn, as his last will and testament, in our presence, and signed by us in his presence.

"WESLEY BUSSARD,
"J. B. HARTER."

Will proved before James M. Amars, clerk Wabash County Court Common Pleas, on the 19th day of December, 1868, by Wesley Bussard.

We, the brethren of the German Baptist Church, assembled in conference at the meeting-house of the brethren in Logan County, Ohio, on the 6th day of June, 1876, decide that the prospective bequest made in the aforesaid last will and testament of Solomon G. Karn, in favor of the German Baptist Church, shall be released. And we hereby authorize the standing committee of this meeting to sign a release of said prospective claim, as set forth in the foregoing will, giving to the mother of said posthumous child, which child is a daughter, now living, and about the age of —— years, all the right, title, claim, and interest prospectively held by us in the aforesaid will.

The German Baptist Church, to which the contingent fund above alluded to has been intrusted, having some fears that the foregoing release may not be sufficient to meet the laws of the State of Indiana, appoint the following brethren, and give them full power to make any release of the funds above alluded to that the laws of the State of Indiana may require: H. D. Davy, Samuel Mohler, and Isaac Studebaker.

Passed by the unanimous consent of this Annual Meeting.

Lightning Rods

1851 ART. 7. Should brethren have the privilege to put up lightning-rods? Considered, that we would not advise brethren to do so; nor would we say to those who have them, to take them down; but advise all our dear brethren to bear with each other in such matters, and try to put their chief trust in God.

1856 ART. 25. Would it be proper to reconsider the 7th query of 1851, concerning the putting up of lightning-rods? We would not advise brethren to put up those rods, but that the brethren should bear with one another in love in such matters.

1864 ART. 3. Is it right, according to the tenor of the gospel, for brethren to erect lightning-rods upon their buildings, and to have their property and lives insured? Answer: As to lightning-rods, we fully agree with the answer given by the Yearly Meeting of 1851, Art. 7: "Considered, that we would not advise brethren to do so, nor would we say to those who have them, to take them down, but advise all our dear brethren to bear with each other in such matters, and to try to put their chief trust in God." We likewise agree with the Annual Meeting of 1847, concerning the insurance of property: "Considered, that we can not advise brethren to do so, neither could we forbid its being done in a mutual way." But as to getting their lives insured, we advise the brethren to make use of no such privilege.

1865 ART. 49. Inasmuch as there is still a difference of opinion relative to brethren having lightning-rods on their buildings, we wish a decisive answer; and not only a reference to the minutes of 1851 and 1804, as we have referred to them, but still get into difficulty. Likewise the same satisfaction in regard to having our property insured is desired. Answer: We consider it would not be advisable to encourage brethren to do so, but think we should bear with brethren who have already done so.

1866 ART. 20. Inasmuch as the subject of lightning-rods has been before the Annual Council, and brethren have only been advised to bear with one another, which we consider is no decision at all; for, if right, why not recommend it to all, and, if wrong, why tolerate it at all? Answer: As we have no command to erect or forbid lightning-rods, we would not advise brethren to put up such rods, but the brethren should bear with one another in love in such matters. (Minutes of 1851, Art. 7, and of 1856, Art. 25.

(Recon. Min.)
1884 SEC. 40. LIGHTNING RODS. In considering the different minutes on the above subject we would recommend to advise members **not to have them,** but to put all their trust in **God... (Accepted.)**

Likenesses

1849 ART. 17. Whether brethren can be allowed to have their likeness or profile taken? Considered, as not advisable.

1857 ART. 15. Is it really considered a sin, according to the gospel, for members of the church to have their likenesses taken? Answer: Members of the church should not have their likenesses taken.

1858 ART. 52. Is it right for a brother to go about taking likenesses with a Daguerrean apparatus? Considered, that it is not right. Rom. i. 23; Deut. xxvii. 15.

1867 ART. 7. Is it consistent with the gospel for members of the church to have their profiles or miniatures taken; and, if inconsistent, how shall the church deal with such members who do so? Answer: As the brethren, in Annual Council in former years, decided it to be wrong, or inconsistent, for members to have their profiles or miniatures taken, we advise them not to do so.

1869 ART. 21. Whereas, it has been repeatedly decided, at our Yearly Meeting, that it is wrong for members of the church to have their likenesses taken, what then is to be done with members that have their likenesses taken? Answer: We consider it not right for members to have their likenesses taken, and if they have done so, they should be admonished to put them away.

1872 ART. 10. Does this district understand the Annual Meeting to mean that we should dispose of our likenesses entirely when it advises us to put them away? (See Minutes of 1869, Art. 21.) Answer: This Annual Meeting understands the phrase "put them away" to mean to put them out of public sight.

(Recon. Min.)

1883 SEC. 18. PICTURES, TYPES of all kinds of human faces taken by artists. We retain all as good and advisory up till 1872, Article 10; but a slip from the faith and the order there occurs,—"to put them out of sight,"—making provision to secrete them, which is an abuse of non-conformity; that is, to have them taken. We reject it and all others.

1903 ART. 1. Inasmuch as the revised minutes of the Yearly Meeting, section 18, are contradictory and indefinite on the subject of pictures, and taking likenesses, photographs, etc., and the custom seems to be growing among us to a great extent, therefore, we ask this Yearly Meeting to give us a definite answer on this subject, and, if considered wrong, what shall be done with members who have them taken? Answer: Readopt the minutes of 1869, Art. 21, believing the same to be in the spirit of the Gospel.

Liquors, Intoxicating, etc.

1781 ART. 2. Concerning distilleries, we heartily counsel all brethren who have distilleries, that they should by all means endeavor to put them away, in order to escape from the evil so often arising from them, and to avoid offense, and in this the brethren are still entirely united with the conclusion made at Pipe Creek, three years ago.

1783 ART. 1. At this great meeting a unanimous conclusion was laid down with regard to the very offensive evil which has endeavored to gain ground in the church, and by which already much mischief has been done, while the brotherly counsel has been repeatedly given that distilleries (or ardent spirits) in the church (among members) should be put away. And since there are still, from time to time, more erected, it has been at this time unanimously concluded that those brethren who have distilleries should be earnestly admonished to put them out of the way; and when they have been admonished in sincere love once and again, and they would not obey the counsel of the church and not put away this loathsome idol, we could not break the bread of communion with them, and have to withdraw, also, the kiss and church council from them until they are willing again to hear the church, as they have promised also at first, at their baptism, before God and many witnesses.

1789 ART. 1. At the council meeting of the brethren it was in union deemed good and necessary, and we feel it also to be our duty, obligation, and office to see to it that union, tranquility, and peace be maintained, that all should be united and of one mind, so that we may, according to the commandment of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, love one another sincerely, and be enabled to love as he has given us a commandment, by which it shall be known that we are his disciples; therefore, it is our desire that every grievance and every offense might be put out of the way; and inasmuch there is a grievance and offense on account of the distilleries of ardent spirits, because the old brethren could not allow them, and sad experience has taught us that almost whole families are gone to destruction, and the children have fallen into drunkenness and a rowdy life, the brethren some years ago came to the conclusion that they should be done away with; but there have been more bought and established since, and the evil is still growing. This makes a grievance and offense, that hardly one church can break bread with the other, and as has happened already, that brethren out of love had come a considerable distance, but when they saw that brethren who had distilleries went to communion, they had to remain away, and go home again in grief, because they had not been able to partake of the memorial of the death of our Lord Jesus Christ, on account of this grievous and offensive thing. Thus grief, disunion, and division are brought upon the church. For this cause we beseech earnestly all brethren who have distilleries to be diligent to put them away; and hereby exhort in heartfelt and humble love, all our much beloved fellow laborers in God, to use herein diligence in admonishing each member to obey this counsel of love, so that peace, love, and union may be planted and restored. But whosoever is not willing to deny himself, as it should be indeed, and can not or will not, out of love, obey this our loving counsel, then we can not consider him otherwise but as such who has not yet died (to sin), and is not yet risen with Christ in newness of life, and that he seeks more the things temporal than eternal; more the things on earth than those in heaven; more the things that pass away than the things that remain, and that he is in great danger to lose the everlasting treasure.

1804 ART. 1. Whether it should or would be allowed to a brother or sister to keep public tavern by or with a license; it was unanimously considered that it could not be allowed, because we are convinced that it can not be done without disorder, and is rather a hindrance to a godly life and quietness of spirit. It has been deemed good in union, that if a brother or sister should undertake to keep tavern, they should be visited in friendship, and in love and seriousness, and in the name of the church be dissuaded and warned from it, and shown unto them what disorder and harm is likely to result thereof. Further it was concluded, that if a brother or sister would not hear, accept, or obey such counsel and admonition, then we would have to consider such as disobedient, and could not have fellowship with them. Yet the sisters, who are bound in such matter by the urging of their husbands, and would gladly be relieved from it, but can not without the consent of their husbands, they should be held less guilty.

1804 ART. 2. Further it has been unanimously concluded, that no brother or sister should be engaged, by or with a permit, to sell strong drink, wine, or ardent spirits, by the quart or larger quantity, because it is feared that disorder and harm will arise thereby. Therefore all members who are engaged therein should be earnestly and faithfully exhorted in love and long-suffering to abstain from it, in order that such example may not lead our youth and offspring into licentiousness and scandal. But if one or the other should not heed this counsel of love and admonition, and not hear the church, we could not look upon such act otherwise than as being disobedient according to an impartial judgment.

1821 ART. 5. Whether brethren may have distilleries or not? It was considered to leave it by what was concluded some thirty years ago, that no brother would be allowed to have a distillery, or to distill ardent spirits.

1822 ART. 9. With regard to distilleries (held or carried on) by members of the church, it was again testified that it could not be permitted.

1822 ART. 21. If a brother has a vendue, and gives freely strong drink, how is it considered? It was considered, that no brother should give strong drink at the sale of his property.

1825 ART. 1. Whether a brother may keep and sell strong drink, has been considered thus: because so often disorder is caused by strong drink, it is improper for a brother to sell it, and should not be at all suffered.

1827 ART. 5. Whether a brother holding an office in the church may distill ardent spirits, was considered, and concluded that it is not becoming for any brother to do so, much less for a brother in office.

1827 ART. 11. How is it considered, if a brother keeps a brewery. and makes strong beer? Considered, though it could not be directly forbidden to a brother, but ought to be left to his own conscience, and (yet we wish) to advise him that the safest way would be, not to carry on such a business, from which may arise so many and great disorders.

1828 ART. 12. Whether brethren may have distilleries was considered, and concluded that it should not be, nor by their children, as far as the authority of the parents extends; and if such brother will not take (or obey) the advice, we could not commune nor have fellowship with him. Also, to sell grain to distilleries (especially) when grain is scarce, should indeed not be.

1832 ART. 3. Whether it would be approved, when brethren engage in storekeeping and selling of strong drinks? Considered, the first might be allowed in cases of necessity, where a brother has no other way to make a living, but the latter in no case whatever.

1833 ART. 8. About the making and using of strong drink, a strong testimony was made at this meeting against it.

1835 ART. 9. How is it considered to sell grain to distilleries? Should not be, except in case of necessity.

1835 ART. 18. How is it viewed for brethren to sell grain to distillers? Considered, that it should not be, especially if grain is scarce and high in price. Besides, it was mentioned of the abuse and harm which comes from what is made by the distiller, and that brethren should take no part in it, and by no means use distilled liquors for a common beverage, nor offer it to those that work for them.

1836 ART. 2. Whether a brother or sister could be allowed to sell strong drink? Considered, that it should absolutely not be.

1837 ART. 11. How it is considered when a brother keeps a brewery, and makes strong beer? Considered, that it could not be directly forbidden to a brother, but ought to be left to his own conscience, and to advise him that the safest way would be not to carry on such a business, from which may arise so many and great disorders.

1838 ART. 3. Whether it is proper for a member to build distilleries, or to distill ardent spirits? Considered, as it has been considered these many years, that it ought not be.

1839 ART. 5. Whether a brother may be intemperate with strong drink or tobacco? No.

1840 ART. 11. What is to be done with a brother who is erecting a distillery, and makes and sells ardent spirits? Considered, that when such a brother has been admonished once and again, and will not be obedient to the counsel of the church, we could not break the bread of communion with him. Besides, it is the advice of the old brethren, to dissuade all the members from the common use of intoxicating drinks, particularly at buildings, hay-making and harvesting.

1841 ART. 14. Concerning the use of ardent spirits, it was considered that it is a great evil, leading to vice and crime, to destruction of peace and property, and to the ruin of body and soul, and that members of the church of Christ ought to refrain from the use of it, except as medicine.

1842 ART. 4. How it is considered if a brother or sister signs the pledge of total abstinence? Considered, that inasmuch as our churches have always been testifying against intemperance, and even against the free use, the making and selling of ardent spirits, it is not advisable for members to put their hands to the pledge, or to meddle with the proceeding and excitement of the world on this subject.

1845 ART. 10. How it is considered, when a brother is carrying on a distillery? Considered in the same light as our ancient brethren did sixty-two years ago, in an annual council-meeting held on Pipe Creek, in Maryland, June 7, 1783, where they said: "Of this old and offensive evil which has been breaking into the church, and by which already much harm has been done, the counsel of the brethren having often been given that distilleries ought to be done away by members in the church, that they concluded at this time unanimously to exhort those brethren that have distilleries, That they should put them away; and when they have been exhorted once and again in sincere love, and they would still not obey the counsel of the church, and put away this disgustful image, the brethren could not break the bread of communion with them, and should also withdraw from them the kiss and church counsel, and that so long until they become willing again to be told, as they have promised in the beginning, at their baptism before God and many witnesses."

1846 ART. 7. Whether a brother may work in distilleries for wages, and whether a brother who owns a mill may buy, sell, and chop grain for distilleries? Considered, that as the use of ardent spirits is always dangerous to the well-being of society, and the brethren frequently have testified against the making and using of the same, it would be best for brethren not to have anything to do with it in any shape or form.

1848 ART. 27. Whether it is according to the spirit of the gospel, as the 14th query in Minutes of Yearly Meeting, 1841, was laid down in Somerset County, Pennsylvania? Considered unanimously, that the sentiments then expressed are right, true, and according to gospel.

1853 ART. 18. Concerning brethren going security for dealers in ardent spirits, in getting their license to sell the same. Considered, that brethren should by no means do so.

1853 ART. 27. Whether it is allowed for brethren to distill fruit, or get it distilled, and sell the liquor? We say, no, not at all.

1853 ART. 38. Is a church justifiable in expelling a member for the crime of drunkenness, so long as members generally continue in the custom, whereby men are made drunkards? Considered, as drunkenness comes directly from moderate drinking, therefore every church should keep the advice of the Yearly Meeting, to use no intoxicating drinks as a beverage, and then they can consistently disown the brother.

1853 ART. 5. Is it right for brethren to have intoxicating liquors at public sales? Considered as wrong, that it should not be so at all, nor at any other gathering.
1853 ART. 6. Is it right for brethren to take a dram in public when in perfect health? We are of opinion that it has the appearance of evil, and should not be indulged in, or partaken of at all, as a beverage.

1856 ART. 4. How is it considered, when a church unitedly agrees not to use ardent spirits, except for medical, mechanical, or communion purpose, and a member of said church will not comply with the above decision? Considered, that such member should be dealt with as in other offenses.

1857 ART. 1. Concerning the use of ardent spirits among the brethren. Considered, that every brother that is intrusted with the oversight of a church, should exert his influence, by example and precept, to induce all the members of his congregation to abstain altogether from the use of ardent spirits, as an article of luxury or as a drink, and not to give it to working hands to drink, admitting it only for medical and mechanical purposes. The same advice is given to all the officers, in all churches, throughout our whole brotherhood.

1862 ART. 26. What is to be done with a brother that buys whiskey by the barrel, and sells it to such as he thinks use it temperately, and when admonished once and again not to sell, he says he will be more careful to sell to none but those who use it temperately? Answer: Any brother dealing in intoxicating liquors, if he continues to do so after being admonished, can not be fellowshiped as a brother.

1862 ART. 47. How is it considered when two members of the church, a visiting brother and his wife, see another visiting brother intoxicated; afterward these two brethren visit the church and commune together, and some two months afterward the first brother named and a private brother saw the same brother again, as they thought, with too much liquor? Still there is no complaint made to the church until some six or seven months after the first transgression, though there have been two or three church meetings held in the time. Then the first brother named lays in complaint. What is now the duty of the church in this and such like cases? Answer: We consider both parties are in fault, and they should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1864 ART. 9. How does the Annual Meeting decide upon the following case: A brother is totally blind, and his occupation for a living is dealing in groceries and in nearly all kinds of intoxicating liquors. He was engaged in that business before belonging to the church, and now claims that the church should not prohibit him from selling liquor, since he could not otherwise make a living. Answer: We consider it is entirely wrong for any brother, whether blind or not, to sell intoxicating liquors.

1864 ART. 11. As the Annual Meeting of 1862 has justly condemned the selling of intoxicating liquors, what does the Annual Meeting say of the practice of such brethren as engage in producing corn and other grain, and sell it to distillers? Answer: As the Scripture explicitly commands us to "abstain from all appearance of evil" (I. Thess. v. 22), we consider it best to advise brethren not to sell any grain to distillers.

1870 ART. 15. Is it in accordance with the spirit of the gospel, and the order of the brethren, for a brother voluntarily to inform the civil authorities against a man for selling liquors contrary to law? Answer: It is not.

Lord's Supper, Love-Feast
(See Communion and Love-Feast)

1832 ART. 2. Whether such may participate in the Lord's Supper who are not members, if there is room? Considered, to leave it to the churches, when there is such room.

1833 ART. 5. Whether the supper must be on the table at feet-washing? (No; there is no such command in the gospel; and if the example of Christ is urged, it is also a mooted, doubtful question on this point. It must be recollected that the translators of our modern version of the New Testament did not believe or practice feet-washing, or know any thing about the real Lord's Supper, calling the communion of bread and wine the Lord's Supper. We all believe that John xiii. 2 is wrongly translated by saying, "Supper being ended" before feet-washing is mentioned, while it is evident, from verses 26-30, that supper was not ended then.)

1839 ART. 2. How the supper should be held? Considered, as it was always held.

1841 ART 3. Whether the brethren have a right to admit friends, who are not members, to sit down with us at the Lord's Supper, if there is room? Considered that making a proper distinction between the supper and the communion of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, there could be no objection to admit friends to the supper, when there is room.

1844 ART. 2. Whether there must be something of the supper on the table when feet-washing is observed? This query has been likewise presented several times before this, and the brethren do still consider that they could not see a better way "to have all things done decently and in order," than the one hitherto followed. I. Cor. xiv. 40.

1848 ART. 24. Is the Lord's Supper observed by the brethren according to the gospel, or, doth the gospel require a supper in holding communion-meetings? Considered, that we have ample testimony in the gospel to enable us to conclude, that a supper was eaten by the Savior and his disciples, in the same night He instituted the communion. (See Matt. xxvi. 20; Mark xiv. 17, 18; Luke xxii. 20; John xiii.; Jude, verse 12.) And the Apostle Paul, after reproving the brethren at Corinth for their disorder, in observing the supper, and speaking of it as the Lord's Supper, expressly declares that he had received from the Lord what he had delivered unto them, telling them how to observe it in proper order. 1 Cor. xi. 23-34.

1849 ART. 14. Is the supper, which the brethren eat in connection with the communion, sacred or common? As there seems to be some reason to believe that the Apostle Paul alludes to the supper, with other means of grace, in the term "ordinances," used (I. Cor. xi. 2), and as we view it as a practice of the apostolic church, to promote the spiritual edification of its members, we consider it a sacred institution, and as such it ought to be observed, especially as it is emphatically called "the Lord's Supper." I. Cor. xi. 20.

1849 ART. 19. Should the supper, or part of it, be on the table at the time of feet-washing, or not? Considered, to leave this matter as hitherto practiced by the brethren.

1849 ART. 21. Is the Lord's Supper a divine or sacred ordinance; and if so, have the children of God a right to invite such as are not members to eat it with them at the same table and time? Considered, to be a divine and sacred ordinance (as all the Lord's ordinances are), and should be eaten by the members only.

1849 ART. 32. Is it material what the supper is composed of at communions? Considered best not to deviate from the order of the old brethren.

1850 ART. 4. Would it not be better, and more correspondent with the gospel, if the brethren would hold the Lord's Supper more in unison with each other; for it appears that some have bread and cheese and some have meat and soup, etc.? Considered, that uniformity would be better.

1853 ART. 21. Have we a right to put away the lamb at the Lord's Supper, and use beef in the place thereof? Considered, that we would rather see a lamb prepared; but inasmuch as Christ has made us free from the ceremonial law, and as there is no command in the New Testament that it must be so, we should bear with each other in love in such matters.

1854 ART. 24. Is it more in unison with the gospel to use lamb at our love-feasts instead of beef? Considered, this query to be answered by the 21st article of the Minutes of 1853.

1856 ART. 19. Would it not be nearer the Word to have the supper prepared and on the table before commencing to wash feet? Referred to Minutes of 1849, Art. 19.

1857 ART. 2. Is it according to the gospel to have the supper on the table at the time the feet are washed? Answer: Inasmuch as it is not expressly declared that Jesus rose from the table, he may probably have risen from a prepared supper, and as the brethren have the supper prepared before they proceed to the washing of feet, with their past practices in relation to these things we are satisfied.

1858 ART. 33. Is it according to the word of God to make use of beef instead of lamb, in eating the Lord's Supper? Answer: It is.

1863 ART. 4. Is it contrary to the gospel to have lamb's meat at the Lord's Supper? We think not; but since the gospel does not give a precept or example of what the supper did or shall consist, the members should try to be in union, love, and forbearance in this matter. (See Minutes of 1853, Art. 21, and 1855, Art. 20.)

1862 ART. 43. Is it in accordance with the word of God to have supper on the table before washing feet? Answer: We consider that it is.

1863 ART. 21. Whereas, there has obtained, of late years, some difference in observing the Lord's Supper among different churches, some setting the supper on the table before feet-washing, while some do not till after (the latter being the old universal practice); whereas the proceedings of the Annual Meeting of last year, in Article 43, have grieved some of our brethren; and, whereas, a conciliatory course should always be pursued when brethren have a preference, as it regards the mode or way of observing an ordinance, so that it is properly observed, and no part of divine truth sacrificed, we therefore recall the decision of the Annual Meeting above referred to, and let the subject of the time of putting the supper on the table stand precisely where it stood previous to the decision of 1862, with the understanding that the churches may and should continue, without making any change either way, until we have further light on the subject, to bring about a more full union.

1855 ART. 20. What is the advice of the General Council to individual members, say four, five, or more, who can not commune with the church because they have beef instead of a lamb at their love-feast? Considered as good advice for such members to submit to the order of the church where they live, and to reflect on the admonition of the apostle (Col. ii. 16, 17): "Let no man, therefore, judge you, in meat or in drink," etc., "which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Again, to learn of His example (Phil. iv. 11), where he says: "For I have learned, in whatsoever state I am [with whomsoever I am, according to the German translation] therewith to be content."

1855 ART. 28. How ought the church to hold a member, who argues and contends that Christ was eating the Jewish passover with his disciples, and at the same time the Jews did eat it; and also contends that it is not binding on the followers of Christ to observe a supper, or any thing more than the bread and wine, and that feet-washing ought to be observed after eating, neither can be satisfied with the brethren that preach otherwise? Considered, that as it appears evident, from John xiii. 1-29; xix. 14; xviii. 28, that Christ's Supper with his disciples was eaten before the Jewish passover, and it appears, from a comparison of Mark xiv. 20, and John xiii. 26, that the supper recorded by Mark, and that recorded by John, are the same. Again, Luke calls the meal which Christ ate with His disciples, at which he instituted the communion, a supper, and a comparison of Luke xxii. 23, and John xiii. 25, will show that they were the same. Now, as it appears plain that the supper, in John xiii, was before the Jewish passover, that of Luke xxii. 20 was likewise before it, and, therefore, not the passover itself. Further, from the Acts of the Apostles, and from the epistles, we find that there was in the church a feast of charity. (See Jude xii.; I. Cor. v. 8; II. Peter ii. 13; Acts xviii. 21). When we take all this evidence into consideration, we think it is sufficient to satisfy every sincere and candid mind, that those who want to adhere to the practice of the church, in the times of the apostles, must have a feast of charity; and those brethren who oppose such a feast, oppose the gospel, and therefore should be admonished. And concerning the washing of feet after the communion, we would say, that it appears, from the reading of the thirteenth chapter of John, that feet-washing was practiced before John leaned on the bosom of Christ (see John xiii. 23); but we find, from John xxi. 20, that John leaned on the bosom of Christ at supper. Therefore, feet-washing was performed by Christ before supper, and certainly before the communion, as the communion was administered after supper.

1866 ART. 13. As it is the practice in some congregations to have the supper on the table at feet-washing, while in others they have it not on, can not this Annual Meeting bring about a uniformity upon this subject? Answer: Though we desire uniformity, yet we would refer the brethren, at present, to Art 21, of the Annual Meeting of 1863

1867 ART. 11. Would it not be better for all the churches to have one mode for holding the Lord's Supper? Answer: We think it would be better, and hope the time will come when there will be a unanimity of practice among the brethren upon this subject, and we recommend all the brethren to pray and labor for this.

1869 ART. 11. Which would be the most consistent with the teachings of the gospel, to have the supper off or on the table at the time of washing feet? Answer: Inasmuch as the teaching of the gospel, in this respect, is differently understood by the brethren, we leave it with the churches to decide which course will give the most satisfaction and peace.

1879 ART. 20. We believe the church to be entirely united upon the principles of the doctrine of Christ. We all agree that feet-washing, the Lord's Supper, and communion stand united, and that they were all given with equal force and demand equal obedience, and that there should be no act upon our part to disconnect them, or place more stress or give more honor to one than to another. This, then, being the case, should we not, in holding our communion, give thanks but once for the supper, just as we do for the bread and wine? We will just say that thanks should be given for the supper, then it should be eaten; likewise for the bread thanks should be given, and also for the cup. Then, in conclusion of the exercises, general thanks should be given for the privilege enjoyed. Would not this be more strictly conforming to the teaching of the gospel? Answer: We decide to make no change.

(Recon. Min.)

1883 SEC. 4. SUPPER. Pertaining to the time and order in the house of the Lord to be as it was understood in the great meeting of 1822, Art. 3,; 1844, Art 2; 1849, Art. 19. (Accepted.)

1887 ART 1. We, the brethren of the Cerro Gordo district of Church, Illinois, would petition the Yearly Meeting to know what should be placed on the table first at the communion in preparing the Lord's Supper? Answer: Bread should be placed first on the table, as it is the staff of life.

Lotteries

1804 ART. 8. Concerning buying lottery-tickets with a hope of gain, it was unanimously concluded that such can not be approved in members, and parents should by all means prevent their children from it, because it can not be viewed any better than other gambling for gain.

1841 ART. 1. Whether it would be right and allowable, according to the gospel, for members to buy-lottery-tickets? Considered, that as a species of gambling for gain's sake, whereby others must necessarily lose, it is wrong, and not allowable at all for a brother.

1850 ART. 29. Is a member, brother or sister, not as justifiable in buying lottery tickets as in purchasing bank stock, or taking eight or ten per cent. interest on money loaned to a brother? Considered, that buying lottery tickets is very wrong; taking more than lawful interest is worse still, and taking stock in a bank ought to be avoided, also, by brethren. (One wrong can never justify another.)

1853 ART. 19. Concerning brethren purchasing and drawing lottery-tickets. Considered, that brethren should not have any thing at all to do with this, or any other species of gambling.

Lord's Supper. (See Communion and Love-Feast)

1827 ART. 6. Whether there should be no other meat but mutton at the supper was generally considered as most agreeable (to our feelings "gemuthlichste") to take mutton, as it has been always customary with the ancient brethren, yet to make no law herein, and to bear with one another.

1828 ART. 15. Whether we might hold small (private, not publicly announced) love-feasts? Considered, in cases where there are but few members (or where a member is on a sick bed, desirous to partake once more), provided that one ordained brother would be present, and that every thing would be done at the right time and in proper order, there could be no objection at all, and it would not be contrary to the (word of) truth; yet care should be taken that it may not cause grief (pressure) or loss of affection.

1842 ART. 3. Whether our love-feasts could not be held more privately and oftener? The advice was to select such times and places as experience may teach to be most suitable for this purpose.

1849 ART. 5. Some members think there is too much feasting at our love-feasts, in providing so much for those who come to feast, and make disturbance at our meetings. Considered, that we are to feed the hungry, if we are led by Christ's example; and the apostle says, "Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head." Rom. xii. 20.

1854 ART. 18. Would it be more in accordance with the gospel to hold our love-feasts on Thursday, before Easter? Considered, that the gospel does not bind us to any particular day.

1859 ART. 2. How is it considered if a church holds a council to consider the propriety of holding a love-feast, and all the members present are jointly agreed to have a communion meeting, and accordingly hold such a meeting; but afterward a member will say we had no love-feast, and will insist that it was only a meal, and not a love-feast? Answer: We consider that it is wrong for a member to do so, and that he should acknowledge it before the church to be a fault, or be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1862 ART. 52. Would it be against the order of the gospel, or of the brethren, for a church, if the members agree to do so, to hold a love-feast, without tendering an invitation to any of the members of the adjoining churches but the ministering brethren? Answer: We consider if a church, for want of room, or for other good reasons, thinks it proper to hold a love-feast without giving a general invitation, it may be permitted to do so.

1869 ART. 10. Do the brethren consider it in accordance with the order of the brethren, and tenor of the gospel, for members of the church to take a drink of water from the table at love-feast, while the tables are being furnished for supper, or thanks are offered at our communion? Answer: Members should tarry one for another, according to Paul to the Corinthians. I. Cor. xi. 33.

1870 ART. 27 Why is it that the brethren use leavened bread at their love-feasts? Had we not better take the example of Christ and the apostles, and use unleavened bread? Answer: We do not believe it right to keep the Jewish customs.

1872 ART. 23. Which is the most in accordance with the gospel, and example of Jesus and his disciples, to close our love-feasts in the evening with singing or with prayer? Answer: This meeting thinks singing last is most in accordance with the gospel.

Love-Feasts—Changes

1828 ART. 9. Whether the holy kiss should have a place at feet-washing (between those who serve and those who are served); and at (before) the breaking of bread? Considered, that it should be. The new commandment (John xiii. 34, 35) brings it very near to both ordinances, and a **love-feast** without this token of love would scarcely deserve the name.

1854 ART. 11. If one or more churches would so choose to come together in the evening to observe the ordinances of the house of God, as delivered unto us by the Savior, and continue public worship next day, believing that thereby some of the evils might be obviated, which too often accompany our love-feasts, would it be considered a departure from the Word? Considered, No; but at the same time we would advise, that the churches should be careful to observe the ordinances of the Lord, at the proper time and in due order, and to avoid all unnecessary changes.

1854 ART. 22. A request that the oldest bishop choose or appoint twelve brethren to hold a communion or love-feast at the time (and place) of Yearly Meeting, as a model, to show us the right order, according to the gospel. Considered, that Christ with his apostles, in that doleful night when He (the Savior) was betrayed, has given a model, and showed us the right order.

1855 ART. 25. Concerning the difference in the time of coming together for holding love-feasts; does it not appear as if there was a division or disunion among us, when some churches meet and have public worship (according to ancient order of the brethren) in the forenoon, others at one, two, or three o'clock, and again others in the evening, about the time when the exercises immediately connected with the Lord's Supper should begin? Could there not a uniform practice be adopted in this, as it used to be among the brethren in by-gone years? Considered, to be left to the consideration of the churches, and to let them decide when their love-feasts are to be held.

1858 ART. 34. Whereas, there is a diversity of opinion among the brethren concerning the mode of celebrating the Lord's Supper; we, therefore, wish the brethren, at the Annual Meeting, to devise some plan, that we may all be alike in our practice. Considered, that inasmuch as the difference is not stated, we recommend the practice heretofore recommended.

1862 ART. 65. Would it not be more in accordance with the gospel, and the example of Christ, to omit returning thanks between the supper and the communion? Answer: We think it best to return thanks, according to I. Thess. v. 18.

1850 ART. 28. How is it considered, when a district or church do not observe the ancient order of the brethren, and have new orders among them? Considered, that no district church has any right to make changes in any thing whatsoever, contrary to the ancient order, without proper investigation before, and the general consent of, the Annual Meeting.

1856 ART. 21. How is it considered, when a branch of a church separates itself from the main body, forwards its ministers without a bishop being present, and pretends to act independent of the counsel of the church and the Yearly Meeting? Considered, that such proceedings are wrong, and highly dangerous, so that love induces us to charge a committee to visit that church and branch.

1858 ART. 57. Can the brethren be in full communion with a brother or a communion of brethren, who do not hold a church council in receiving applicants for baptism, and who do not ask those who are baptized to renounce the devil and all the sinful practices of the world or flesh, and who do not practically follow the doctrine of self-denial? Considered, that we think such can not be in full communion with us. Acts x. 47; Prov. xv. 22; I. John ii. 15-17; Titus ii. 12.

1878 ART. 5. How is it considered, and what shall be done with a minister who travels from one place to another over the brotherhood, using his influence against the order of the church, by promising outsiders that if they unite with the church they need not wear the covering worn by the sisters, and that they can wear their hats, etc.? Also, telling them they can be baptized and hold their membership with the church where he lived, and where such things are allowed? Answer: The church where a minister is known to be guilty of such wrong in public or in private speaking, shall **take the testimony against him,** and send it in writing to the church in which he has his membership; and if that church will not stop him from going among other churches and using his influence against the order of the Brethren, then the elders of the adjoining churches shall be notified of the fact, and if they will not stop him, the church in which he has been guilty of such things, shall call for a committee from Annual Meeting, and said committee shall go to the church in which the offense has been committed, and call for the offending minister to meet them there, and they shall try his case as if they were in his own church, and if they find him guilty of such rebellion against the order of the general brotherhood, they shall **take** his office from him, and notify his church at home of the fact, unless he gives evidence of repentance and reformation.

Majority Rule

1880 ART. 1. Whereas, the progress of the Annual Meeting of 1879 was unnecessarily delayed by the opposition of one elder to an answer, to the dissatisfaction of many, we **ask** this district meeting to ask Annual Meeting to require a very small minority to yield to a very large majority in the Annual Meeting, and also in our common council meeting. Answer: Granted; unless it would be in cases where the majority would attempt a departure from the word of God and the general order and usage of the brotherhood.

1880 ART. 13. Shall the majority of a church, some of whose members say that they would rather their children would fish, hunt, play ball, and other like vain amusements on Sundays, than have them go to Sunday-school, prevent other brethren from collecting their children together in their school house on the Sabbath day to teach them the Scritpures, when such school is conducted in the order of Annual Meeting? We ask Annual Meeting not to let a majority prevent a minority from meeting at a school-house to teach the Scriptures in the capacity of a Sunday-school. Answer: The request is granted.

1881 ART. 13. WHEREAS, Annual Meeting is always a large assembly, and it is next to impossible to get anything like a definite vote from the whole assembly; and even if we could obtain a definite vote on every question from the whole assembly, the decisions must necessarily partake of the sentiments of the district in which Annual Meeting is held, on account of the superior number of voters by which it is represented; and,

WHEREAS, The brotherhood can be evenly represented by delegates, and the work much more expeditiously and satisfactorily performed by confining the voting entirely to the delegates; therefore,

Resolved, That we pray Annual Meeting to make all her decisions by a majority vote of the delegates present. Answer: We decide to make no change.

1881 ART. 11. WHEREAS, The officers in the church are the servants of the church, and it is therefore reasonable that they should be the servants of the majority, and as it is possible for a person to be elected against his will and fill an office by a minority (with the plurality system) only to be publicly disgraced by being deposed by a majority who had never chosen him,

Resolved, That we petition Annual Meeting to authorize all elections in the brotherhood to be made by a majority of the votes cast.

Answer: We decide that no change shall be made at present in the manner of electing our church officers.

Marriage

1789 ART. 4. Concerning marriages of near relations, especially cousins, was unanimously considered, and deemed good that such marriages should not at all be, and that parents should warn their children earnestly in this respect, so that offense and scandal might be prevented, which have been so often occasioned by it, and that our dear youth may not in ignorance be led into something, where, perhaps, afterward their thoughts might be accusing one another about those things which can not be altered any more, and therefore should be well considered previously in the fear of God.

1804 ART. 3. It was concluded, in concord and union, that ministers should be uniform in solemnizing marriage according to the law of our country, by publishing the bans of every couple three times, and this in the section where they live or reside, as near as possible, so that if there were any sufficient cause or impediment of such intended marriage, it might be brought to light, and all things be conducted decently and in order.

1818 ART. 1. Concerning trouble arising in some churches on account of the marriage of young people, and their solemnization. Inasmuch some desire to hold fast to the counsel or conclusions of the old brethren, which was, that previous to marriage the bans were published three times, which they think is a good order and not at all inconsistent with the gospel; but now some assert that this publishing at the close of the meeting was against their conscience, and think that the effect of the word preached before was thereby interrupted; while, on the other hand, brethren think that there is danger in solemnizing marriage without publishing before, inasmuch we can not know how matters stand with young folk, and there might be danger, even if they are neighbor's or brother's children; and we think, if we were so closely restricted by our conscience not to publish the bans, then we would also marry none. Yet we desire to control no man's conscience, provided he acts for peace, and as they say, for conscience' sake. We desire all housekeepers in churches might be united in one mind to hold fast to the counsel of the old brethren; for unto peace God has called us.

1819 ART. 3. How it is considered, that brethren receive other preachers (from other denominations) into their houses, in order to solemnize the marriage of their children after the manner of the world? Considered, that matrimony is a solemn matter, whether we commence it with or without a blessing, and hence we think we should have so much love for our children as to be concerned that they might enter upon that state with a blessing; and we believe no man can communicate such but he that is animated by the Holy Spirit, by whom he will also be led into all truths. Hence we should have our children married by a brother who is authorized to do it, with a blessing and brief exhortation; also without too great superfluity of meat and drink, so that we can believe to be pleasing to God—for all extravagance is sin.

1819 ART. 4. Whether a member is permitted to marry without counsel of the church, and without publishing the bans? Answer: We know that all who have entered into the covenant of grace have promised also to receive counsel, and it seems to us, in such an important matter as marriage is, we should by all means seek counsel of our fellow believers. And concerning the publishing of the bans, it is our loving counsel, and daily experience teaches us, that it is very good to hold to a good order, inasmuch by the publishing the bans many an accusation is cut off, while on the other hand much deception is prevented, which would have free course without the bans.

1827 ART. 9. Concerning taking pay for solemnizing marriages and preaching funeral sermons. It was unanimously considered, that it should not be among brethren.

1848 ART. 9. Whether a brother may be allowed, according to the gospel, to take pay (when offered) for performing the ceremony of marriage? Considered, that this meeting can not advise brethren to take a fee, and would leave it, as a matter of conscience, to the ministering brother, with the advice of the church in which he lives.

1849 ART. 29. How is it considered, when a brother solemnizes a marriage contract, between a sister, whose first husband is not known to be dead, and another individual? Considered, that under such circumstances, a brother ought not to act.

1850 ART. 16. What is the duty of a minister, when called upon to solemnize marriage, when one of the parties is the child of members, and these parents not consenting to the match, yet the minister knows of no other objection but the daughter's going from home to get married? Considered, as not advisable without the consent of the parents. Paul says, "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." Rom. xii. 18; Heb. xii. 14.

1854 ART. 16. Is it allowed by the gospel for a sister, after her husband is dead, to be married to her step-son? Considered, not allowed according to the following passages: I. Cor. v. 1; Levit. xviii. 8. Churches should be watchful to purge out such a leaven from among them.

1855 ART. 11. Is a speaker allowed to take any amount of money for marrying that may be offered him, and if so, how much? Referred to Art. 9 of the Yearly Meeting in Wayne County, Ohio, 1848, which reads thus: "Considered, that this meeting can not advise brethren to take a fee, and would leave it, as a matter of conscience, to the ministering brother, with the advice of the church in which he lives."

1857 ART. 14. How is it considered, if ministering brethren take as much as ten dollars, as a fee for performing the marriage ceremony; and does the gospel allow ministers a fee under any circumstances? Answer: The gospel does not allow ministers to take a fee.

1858 ART. 18. Whereas, we are aware that the decision of the last Annual Meeting, in relation to the subject presented in the fourteenth query of said meeting, has given a great deal of dissatisfaction, and is, to a great extent disregarded, thus bringing the decisions of the Annual Meeting into disrespect; we therefore recommend that this meeting reconsider that subject, and if the decision of the last meeting is sustained, it is desirable that some scriptural authority should be given for it, as should be done in all cases. Reconsidered, and concluded to adopt the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1848. (Considered, that this meeting can not advise brethren to take a fee, and would leave it, as a matter of conscience, to the ministering brother, with the advice of the church in which he lives. Minutes of 1848, Art. 9.)

1862 ART. 17. Is it considered right, according to the gospel, for a brother to marry a woman (not a sister) that is divorced from her husband, when it is not known whether that divorced husband is dead, and the ordained elder, who performed the marriage ceremony, contends that all is right? Answer: We consider it wrong for any brother in the ministry to perform such marriage, and also wrong, according to the gospel, for any brother or sister to be married to any such party.

1866 ART. 30. A young man enlists in the service of the government of the United States, and after being in camp a month, deserts and returns home secretly, and, with the consent of his parents, changes his name to his mother's maiden name, retaining his given name as a middle name. He then goes into another part of the state and gets married, and becomes a member of the church under his assumed name. Some six or eight months afterward the church gets to hear of this, and when he is asked concerning it, he frankly admits that it was so, and was sorry that it so happened. What is now the duty of the church in this case?. Answer: Inasmuch as said brother entered into the marriage contract under a fictitious name, and also in violation of Romans xiii. 1, and has also deceived the church, the duty of said church would be to make it his duty to have the marriage legalized, and make good satisfaction for said deception.

1871 ART. 20. Can the church hold a man and his wife, both members of the church, when the one will not live with the other under any circumstances whatever? Answer: We consider that the elders in the adjoining church shall investigate

been always customary with the ancient brethren, yet to make no law herein, and to bear with one another.
the case, and dispose of it according to its merits and the principles of the gospel. Being informed of the case that gave rise to the above query, we name John Metzger, Samuel Lehman, and Daniel Fry to attend to it.

1871 ART. 23. If a speaker's or visiting brother's wife dies, and he marries a woman that is not a member of the church, can he still officiate in his office? A scriptural decision is requested. Answer: We think he can; for where there is no law, there is no transgression.

(Recon. Min.)

1884 SEC. 31. ON MEMBERS ENTERING INTO MATRIMONY. In regard to Article 23, 1871, Book of Minutes, we recommend to advise, they should marry in the church. (Accepted.)

1926 ART. 1. Inasmuch as the ring ceremony in solemnizing marriages is becoming so popular among the popular preachers of the popular churches of the world, is it in harmony with our humble profession and the teaching of Christ, for our ministers and elders to use the ring ceremony? John says, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world." As the ring ceremony is highly esteemed among the people of the world and as "that which is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in the sight of God," we pray this Annual Meeting to consider and answer whether the ring ceremony is in line with our humble profession and the Gospel. Luke 16:15; James 4:4. Answer: We consider that it is not in harmony with the Scriptures to use the ring ceremony in solemnizing marriage. Passed.

1830 ART. 2. Whether a brother may take a wife who has already a husband, but is deserted and set free by him? This has long since been considered that it can not be according to the word and gospel.

1848 ART. 15. If a sister married a man, and gets to know, afterward, that he had already a wife, and she immediately forsakes him, hath she the liberty to get married to another man, while that man is yet living, according to the gospel? Considered, that we submit the case to her own judgment, and advise her, that she should, in future, be cautious, and take counsel of the church.

1850 ART. 4. How it is considered, if a sister marries an unbelieving husband, who afterward doth ill-treat her, by slander and debauchery, and, in many ways, abuses and grieves her, so as to forbid and prohibit her going to meeting, or to any of her friends and relations; she then, upon the advice of her friends (members of the church), leaves him, and tries to get rid of him by law, upon which he offers to give himself up to the church, and is willing to do what the church lays upon him, acknowledgeth that he has done wickedly, and promises to do better; but he having made such promises before, and did not come up to them, the friends of the sister do not think it proper for her to unite with him again? Considered, that we could not advise the sister to leave her husband; but if she did so, she ought to remain unmarried, according to Paul's writing to the Corinthians (I. Cor. vii. 11-13.)

1850 ART. 10. Whether we can hold, as members, man and wife, that live together in strife, that have been parted on that account, and now live together, but not as man and wife should? Considered, that we could not hold such as members.

1850 ART. 17. How it is considered, when a sister has an unbelieving husband, who gets drunk and abuses her, and tempts to kill her with an ax; she then leaves him and returns to her father, who then goes to the housekeeper in the church for advice, upon whose advice a bill of divorce is obtained? Considered, that a housekeeper has no right to give such advice, without counseling the church, neither has the sister a right to get divorced without such counsel. (See Matt. xix. 6-9; I. Cor. vii. 11.)

1850 ART. 23. If a woman leaves her husband for his extreme cruelty, and he obtains a bill of divorce and marries another woman, and his first wife afterward marries another man, both being unbelievers, can such persons be received into the church of Christ, according to the gospel? Considered, that we could not receive such, according to the gospel. Rom. vii. 1-3; I. Cor. vii. 10, 11, 39.

1858 ART. 1. Can a person be received into the church who is uncle to his wife? Or, do the brethren think the gospel will not allow such a person becoming a member of the church? Considered, that if he is uncle to his wife by marriage, he may be received, if by blood relation, he should not be.

1858 ART. 9. Would it not be advisable for the Annual Meeting to make a form for the brethren to perform matrimony? Answer: It is thought not advisable.

1858 ART. 10. How is it considered when a difficulty arises between husband and wife, and the wife depart from her husband, is it the duty of the husband to pursue the course prescribed in Matt. xviii. 15-17? Answer: We consider it is.

1860 ART. 10. A brother has a wife, who is not a member of the church, and she refuses to live with him peaceably; and having been living apart from him for more than two years the brethren acquainted with the circumstances believing the wife to be the cause of the trouble, she now demands a divorce. Now, brethren, we would be very glad if you will give us advice in this case. Answer: We think a brother can not grant or accept of a divorce for any cause but that of fornication. "But I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery." Matt. v. 32; I. Cor. vii. 15.

1862 ART. 3. If a sister is married to a man, who, after living with her awhile, leaves her, and she, not hearing from him for several years, marries again, can she be held as a member? Answer: No; she could not be held as a member.

1856 ART. 18. How are we to hold a brother and sister who lived together for some years in lawful matrimony, but not very agreeably, and now they are separated—the brother living with his children in Iowa, and the sister with her friends in Ohio? The church or churches where such members live should investigate the matter, and judge according to the gospel and the circumstances or facts in the case, in the fear of the Lord.

Meeting Houses

1828 ART. 14. Whether we may build meeting-houses? Considered, to leave it over to every church to do as they deem good.

1838 ART. 2. Whether it is considered proper to hold singing schools in our meeting-houses? Chiefly considered, that meeting-houses are no proper places for holding singing-schools therein.

1853 ART. 33. Is it right to discuss moral questions in our meeting-houses? Considered, that our brethren had better keep the houses, built for the worship of God, exclusively for that special purpose.

1854 ART. 3. Is it agreeable to the gospel for a brother to give ground for meeting houses to such that do not preach the gospel in its purity; and if not, how is he to be dealt with? Considered, as positively inconsistent with the gospel, as appears from the following testimonies: II. John 10, 11; Eph. v. 11; II. Cor. vi.

14-18. And as regards the manner of dealing with such, we recommend that they should be admonished, and required to make acknowledgment.

1855 ART. 14. Is it conforming with the world to build meeting-houses? Answer: No, if built without unnecessary ornaments, and only for the worship of God.

1859 ART. 27. In relation to the questions from Owl Creek Church, Knox County, Ohio, growing out of the serious difficulties which that church has concerning its meeting-house, the following advice was given: We consider it best that the brethren, in meekness and patience, wait for the further manifestation of the will of God upon the matter. And it was recommended that the case be remembered by the brethren in general in prayer.

1864 ART. 5. Is it in accordance with the gospel for brethren to donate money toward building meeting-houses of other denominations? Answer: Finding no gospel upon the subject alluded to in the query, we leave it to every one's conscience to direct in the case.

1865 ART. 11. A church needs a meeting-house, and by a unanimous counsel of all present, agrees to build one by taxation, each one paying in proportion to his true valuation; is it then consistent to make a non-compliance with said counsel a test of fellowship? Answer: We consider that all those who fail to comply with the counsel, would fall into the judgment of the church, but we recommend in such cases that disinterested brethren from some other church or churches be called to the council.

Meetings—Protracted

1842 ART. 2. Whether it will be to the edification of the church of God to hold protracted meetings, and to introduce mourning-benches, in imitation to the new measures adopted by different sects and denominations? The brethren generally considered, that it was advisable to be very cautious, and at all times to keep good order in accordance with the doctrine and example of the apostles, and not to introduce such innovations like mourning-benches, etc.

1858 **ART. 31. Is it contrary** to the gospel for brethren to hold meetings for a number of days in succession, in one place, in order to preach the pure word of God, and to administer the ordinance of baptism to those who believe the word and receive it? Considered, not contrary to the gospel, if the believer is proceeded with according to the gospel and the order of the brethren, as given by the Annual Meeting of 1848, Art. 3.

1858 ART. 50. Is it agreeable to the gospel to hold a protracted meeting, say for one week or ten days in succession? Answer: As to the phrase "protracted meetings," we know nothing of it in the gospel; but as touching the frequency of the saints meeting together, we find no limits in the gospel, so they are held in the order of the house of God.

1874 ART. 17. Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting is favorable to the holding of protracted meetings, what right have the bishops and householders of certain districts of churches to limit such meetings to a series not exceeding three in number? Answer: They have the right, if the meetings are not conducted in the order of the gospel and of the church.

Meetings—Social

1858 ART. 40. Is it according to the gospel for brethren to hold what are called social meetings, and to give liberty to all present to rise and speak, so that members of other societies feel themselves at liberty to admonish? Considered, that social meetings should be strictly held in order, and to give liberty to all present to rise on their feet and admonish, is not in order.

1861 ART. 1. Are we to understand by the grant of social meetings, as decided in Annual Meeting of 1858, to make public appointments frequently where there is an organized church and preaching every two weeks, and in conducting them, liberty to be given to any brother or sister, or, if time admit, for all to rise to their feet by course, and exhort; and, if not so to be understood, what will the Annual Council say the order of social meetings shall be? Considered, that the order should be according to that rule laid down by the apostle in I. Cor. xiv. 27-40. And to unite with other professors in worship in our meetings is inconsistent with the gospel and the practice of the church.

1862 ART. 66. We wish to have the first query in the minutes of the last Yearly Meeting reconsidered, and a more definite answer given. Answer: In reconsidering the query alluded to, we conclude that we can not give a more definite answer than was given in 1858, query 40, and in 1861, query 1.

(Recon. Min.)

1884 SEC. 24. SOCIAL MEETINGS. What is termed social meetings to the general acceptation of the term, have none; but recommend that all our meetings for solemn worship be held as set forth in **Miami Valley Petition** of 1880, and also resolutions of August 24, 1881. (Accepted.)

Meetings For Public Worship

1838 ART. 5. Whether a member has a right to appoint a meeting for a teacher who is not in our connection? Considered, that it ought not to be according to the exhortation of the apostle. II. John v. 10.

1840 ART. 8. Whether we might hold meetings at the houses of members that are excluded (in the first degree, according to Matt. xviii.), or to visit them in the name of the church on their request? Considered, that when the excommunicated members appear to be penitent, and request visit and meeting of the brethren, it might be readily granted.

1840 ART. 12. How is it considered, when teachers at the beginning of meetings exhort so long, and consume so much time with speaking before prayer? Considered that it would be more edifying to make the exhortation as brief as possible, since the apostle teaches that first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, etc., be made. I. Tim. ii. 1-4.

1843 ART. 3. Whether a teacher has a right, in his exhortation to prayer, to give liberty to those who do not choose to bow down with us, to rise up in prayer? Considered, that we are to exhort our hearers to humility in prayer, and as it is generally the case, to bow down on our knees; but where there is no room, or where the ground does not permit kneeling, the brethren could see no wrong in permitting in such or another case of necessity to rise up on our feet in prayer.

1843 ART. 12. How it is considered when one teacher commonly consumes as much time as two, three, and four hours, in one meeting, speaking continually? The unanimous opinion of the brethren was, that inasmuch as God is a God of order, and such long-continued discourses must needs be fatiguing, both to the teacher and the hearers, cause disorder, and deprive other teachers of the opportunity to speak, to the edification of the church, this conduct is out of all order, and ought not to be, and it would always be best not to prolong our meetings beyond the usual time.

1844 ART. 5. About singing in different voices, at public meetings, it was considered that the singing of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, is a part of divine worship, which we ought to perform always in the spirit, and in truth, and with solemnity; to be watchful, that nothing in our singing should detract our minds from the serious contemplation of what we sing; that we ought to avoid such light tunes which may make us merry rather than serious; and that our singing should always tend more to the glory of God, than to the tickling of the outward ear. I. Cor. xiv. 15; Ephes. v. 19; Col. iii. 16.

1847 ART. 3. Whether it is advisable for brethren, who are teachers, to ocupy a stand three or four steps high, when they are invited to hold meetings in the meeting-houses of the different persuasions or sects through our country? Considered advisable that teachers should practice discretion and humility, in taking their stands for speaking, and that members should, also, use forbearance, and not take offense, in such matters, if circumstances would make it preferable for teachers to occupy such a stand.

1848 ART. 2. Whether it be proper to reconsider Art. 3, of last year's minutes, relating to preaching from a stand? Reconsidered, that all our brethren should endeavor, as much as possible, to avoid giving or taking offense.

(Special)

1848 ART. 2. Whether it is proper, if more than two or three teachers should rise in a common meeting to speak? Considered, that a due sense of order and propriety will teach us how to conduct our meetings, so as to edify, and not to weary, the congregation. (See I. Cor. xiv. 32, 33, 40.)

1848 ART. 11. Can it be considered prudent, or profitable, for members to frequent camp-meetings, or protracted meetings, from time to time? Unanimously considered, not to be profitable for members so to do.

1849 ART. 23. What should be done with such members, as neglect attending our meetings for six or more months, and when the yearly visit is paid them, they seem or feel satisfied with the church, and when there is a love-feast, they generally attend and commune? Considered, that the ministering brethren in the church, in which such members are, should earnestly admonish them to adhere to the advice of the Apostle Paul (Heb. x. 25.)

1849 ART. 41. Concerning the propriety, or necessity, of giving meals to the congregation, at common meetings? Considered, that we leave this matter altogether discretionary to every individual, church, or family.

1850 ART. 39. How is it considered, when there is a regular meeting in rotation in a district, and a meeting is requested by people who are yet without the church, regularly every four or six weeks? Considered, that a meeting may be held at the house of any one that is friendly to the Brethren, on his request, if not interfering with other appointments.

1855 ART. 21. Is it according to the gospel, at the close of our meetings, to sing a hymn, and invite mourners to come forward, and if none will come, to sing another hymn, and give another invitation, and lastly, to tell the congregation to rise on their feet, and, with raised hand, speak a blessing over the people? Considered, that this is not agreeable with the gospel, and should not be done.

1859 ART. 6. Have the brethren the privilege of singing a hymn or two without lining them, if some brother mentions the page, before commencement of worship, while the congregation is assembling? And have ministering brethren the privilege to read a hymn, before lining and singing, at the opening of the public service? Answer: We consider these queries of but little import; but as singing is a part of divine worship, it should be conducted in order by those engaging in it. And whether a hymn should, or should not, be read previously to lining it, may be left to the option of those proposing the hymns.

1862 ART. 2. With regard to prayer-meetings, how should they be conducted? Answer: All our meetings for divine service should be conducted according to the gospel, which requires all things to be done decently and in order.

1862 ART. 10. How are we to proceed with members who will neglect to attend council and public meetings, and that for months? Answer: Such members should be admonished, again and again, and their reasons for non-attendance ascertained, and the danger of living in such a manner set before them. (See Heb. x. 25.)

1862 ART. 41. What will the Annual Council advise in the following cases, viz.: A number of brethren in district A becomes prejudiced against the body of the church and will not attend council and other meetings, after being cited frequently to do so. But they will attend meetings and councils in district B, or the adjoining district, and they also will contribute means and money for the benefit of the said district B, to the entire neglect of their own district? Also, what will Annual Council say of the brethren in district B who encourage those brethren of district A to continue in such a practice? Answer: We consider it wrong for brethren to aid other districts and to neglect their own, and we also consider it wrong for a neighboring church to pursue such a course as district B is said to have done.

1862 ART. 60. How shall we regard the conduct of a brother who travels through different churches, and when he comes into the congregation he falls down on his knees and makes a private prayer, mortifying some of the members? Had he not better make his private prayers where no human eye can see him? Answer: We think it is out of order to do so, and the brother should do so no more.

1863 ART. 11. Is it in accordance with the direction of the apostle (I. Tim. ii. 1, etc.,) to have any exhortation before prayer, on opening meeting? We do not consider Paul's exhortation confined to opening the meeting, and therefore believe a word of exhortation to prayer very proper in opening the meeting, provided the exhortation is short, and confined principally to prayer.

1863 ART. 25. Is it according to Scripture for (any or) each brother of the church to have the privilege to appoint meetings, attend the same, and preach? We think it is not in accordance with the gospel, nor promotive of love and union, but rather a fruitful source of contention, strife, and disunion; therefore, no brother should assume such authority, neither should any brother encourage such in their proceedings; and if a brother will preach contrary to the will of the church he can not do it in the name of the church. Approved by this Yearly Meeting.

1868 ART. 16. How is it considered for brethren to open their doors, or give consent that fallen teachers should preach in their houses, or to attend their meetings, etc.? Answer: We consider it wrong to open our houses for such to preach in, to attend their meetings, or to do any thing whatever to encourage them to preach.

1870 ART. 19. How is it considered for members of the church to absent themselves from meetings, from time to time, without any good or lawful excuse? Answer: We consider it wrong for members to absent themselves from meeting, and should they do so for three or four times, they should be visited to ascertain the cause; and if no good cause can be given, they should be admonished. Heb. x. 24, 25.

1881 ART. 20. Is it according to the order of the Brethren and elders, or any other brethren, to hold secret or clandestine meetings for the purpose of circulating petitions, or for any other purpose? Answer: No; and brethren doing as above stated should fall into the judgment of the church.

1897 ART. 1. Inasmuch as there seems to be a little difference in the manner of reading a Psalm or Prophecy, while some rise to their feet to read, others remain seated, would it not be advisable to have one order in this as well as in other things? Answer: Yes, we agree with the query for one order. We think it more edifying to rise up to read a Psalm or Prophecy; according to the Savior's language: "And stood up for to read." St. Luke iv. 16.

1902 ART. 1. Inasmuch as there are some churches which have dispensed with the reading out of the Prophets or Psalms at their meetings, we believe it has always been the order of the church throughout the brotherhood to read at our regular meetings. We think there should be more of a oneness among us. We wish the Yearly Meeting of 1902 to give an answer to the above query. Answer: Yes. We, your sub-committee, unanimously agree that it has always been the order of our brethren to read from the Prophets or Psalms at our regular meetings, and we think that brethren who have dropped from the order that our Savior has given us, ought again re-establish the example Jesus gave in Luke 4. 16, 17; Acts 13. 14, 15; Rom. 15. 4; I Cor. 1. 10.

1841 ART. 4. Whether it is proper for teachers to speak both German and English in meetings, when there are only a few English members, the majority of the church being German? Considered, that it is right, and our duty, to preach the gospel to every nation as far as we are able, yet so that in such a case not too much time ought to be taken up in English.

1842 ART. 9. How it is considered, when brethren who are not ordained, in the presence of ordained brethren, without being requested, take the lead at public meetings, and at morning and evening worship; seat themselves at the head of the table, and call upon ordained brethren to be free? Considered, that order is an essential rule of the house of God, and that it would be most praiseworthy if all the brethren did try in honor to prefer one another, and each one to be faithful in his station, not seeking the uppermost seats, nor forgetting the advice of the apostle (I. Pet. v. 5), "Ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder."

1858 ART. 8. Does the gospel convey the idea that the public practical use of the spiritual gifts, such as prayer, exhortation, teaching, doctrine, and prophesying, etc., are alone confined to the chosen officers of the church, or does it extend that privilege to every member, especially male members of the church, if the influence of the spirit of Christ so dictate to him? Answer: As it regards prayer, it is considered that private members may pray in public, if liberty be given by elder brethren. But exhortation, teaching and prophesying seem to be duties and privileges belonging to the officers of the church. (See I. Cor. xiv. 32.)

1858 ART. 39. How should brethren proceed, after preaching, relative to getting members to join the church? Shall the preacher, while singing a hymn, give an invitation to those who wish to join the church to come forward, or shall he leave it to them to make their own application? Considered, that it is best to let them make their own application, as in Acts ii. 37, and xvi. 30.

1862 ART. 69. How is it considered when ministering brethren, after preaching, go into the congregation and invite persons to join the church? Answer: We consider it best to do as was done in Acts ii.

(Recon. Min.)
1884 SEC. 23. HOW SHOULD THE BRETHREN PROCEED AFTER PREACHING TO GET PERSONS TO UNITE WITH THE CHURCH? We refer to Article 39, 1858.

Members, Disorderly

1850 ART. 8. If a brother, or sister, commit a gross crime, such as getting drunk, etc., can it be settled, by any visiting brethren, without bringing it before the church, or what course is to be pursued in such cases? Considered, that a brother, or sister, guilty of a crime, as set forth in the question, should be brought before the church, agreeable to Paul's first letter to Timothy (chap. v. 20): "Them that sin, rebuke before all, that others, also, may fear."

1881 ART. 9. What is to be done with a brother or elder who goes a distance of ninety or one hundred miles, to preach in another arm of the church, which is under the charge of Elder S., and gives liberty to disowned members who were guilty of railing against the council of Annual Meeting, and one who is guilty of gross immorality, to take part in the meeting, and to close the meeting with prayer, although Elder E. knew the circumstances and the relation of said members to the church? The members of said church being offended by Elder E.'s proceedings, informed Elder S., their elder, and he wrote to Elder E., who agreed to meet Elder S. and offended members in council, at the place where the offense was committed, but when the council was called Elder E. refused to attend because he had corn to husk; however, the members in council considered the case, and decided that Elder E. should make an acknowledgment at the place where the offense was committed, and informed Elder E. of the decision, but he refused to comply or give satisfaction. Answer: This district meeting considers that Elder E. has done wrong, and refers this to Annual Meeting for their decision. Answer: It is wrong for an elder to do so, and we send a committee to get him in order and settle the troubles. And all elders, ministers, or members disregarding the council of a church in fellowshiping expelled members, subject themselves to the council of the church.

Members Numbered

1866 ART. 10. Would it be profitable and apostolic to number the brethren and sisters, and report the numerical strength of the brotherhood at the next Annual Meeting? Answer: We consider it not apostolic, inasmuch as the apostles never gave the exact number of believers. Acts ii. 4-47; iv. 4.

Ministers Fallen

1858 ART. 11. Is it according to the gospel to expel a brother from his office, whether deacon or minister, and yet leave him stand as a member? Answer: We have a right—according to the gospel; inasmuch as he is put into office by the council of the church, by the council of the church the office can be taken from him. I. Tim. iii.

1872. ART. 15. Can brethren in the ministry who have fallen into the gross crimes mentioned by Paul in I. Cor. v., ever be restored to their office? And if they can, in what way shall it be done? Answer: We think they may, under some circumstances, and the church having to act should judge whether such circumstances exist. But we think it should be, by the unanimous consent of the church, and in the presence of at least three elders. But there are some cases so grievous that we can not receive them into their office.

1879 ART. 4. Is it agreeable with the gospel and the rule of the Brethren for a church or a committee to take from a minister the office of the first and second degrees of the ministry at home in his own church, and then allow him the liberty to preach in other districts of the church, or in other congregations? Answer: Not agreeable to the gospel and order of the church to do so.

Ministers Making Appointments in Other Districts

1858 ART. 26. How is it considered if a brother, who is a minister, would make appointments some distance from home, where there is an organized church, and would hold meetings, and baptize, without referring to the brethren that had the oversight there of the church, when the brethren live in the immediate neighborhood, and might be consulted conveniently? And if this is wrong, how should such a brother be dealt with? Considered, that when ministering brethren go out of their own church, to labor and to administer the ordinances of the gospel in another district, they should do so with the consent of the laborers of the district, into which they go, when it can be conveniently obtained. And brethren who do not adhere to this counsel, do not labor to promote peace and love, and should be admonished by the church.

Ministers Making Mistakes

1908 ART. 3. In case a minister makes a mistake or blunder, or has some unbecoming habit in his preaching, and nothing is said to him about it until the yearly visit when a charge is laid against him on the visit with a request that he be admonished on the matter before the whole congregation of members thus severely hurting the feelings of some members, would it not therefore be advisable to decide that in all such cases where it is necessary for an admonition to be given, it be done in a private way? Answer: This Yearly Meeting advises that it should be done in a private way and that brethren who are thus admonished so adapt their labors that they would be edifying. See First Corinthians 14. 3 and 26.

Ministers Moving

1833 ART. 3. Whether a brother who was chosen to the (ministry of the) word in one church, and moves into another with a good testimony, can be relieved from his office (or rather literally put back from it)? It was always considered, when a ministering brother moves out of the church which chose him, he moves out of his office—that is, before he is fully ordained; and that it was at the option of the church into which he moves to receive him with his office or not. If his life and conduct inspire love and confidence, it will not be long before he may be called to exercise his ministry again. Have patience!

1835 ART. 8. How is it considered, if ministers move into churches where there is no ordained elder, whether they can be received where no bishop is present? No; there ought to be one or more bishops invited for the occasion, or the matter postponed to another time. Meanwhile, those new comers may serve in their office as guests.

1838 ART. 7. Whether a teacher has the right to remove out of the church without the counsel of the same? Considered, that it is right and good that a brother, in such an important undertaking should seek the counsel of his church.

1859 ART. 30. If a brother in the ministry or deaconship move from one congregation to another, having a certificate of good standing in his office, has the congregation to which he moves a right to refuse to receive him with his office? Answer: We consider they have not.

1862 ART. 9. When official members move from one district to another, should they be received with hand and kiss, or is a letter sufficient? Answer: Art. 9, of the minutes of 1846, re-adopted, and here to be re-printed: "Is a brother, that was a speaker or deacon, and has moved into another church, properly reinstalled in his office, if an ordained brother takes the counsel of the church, and announces the same to him, without he being received by the members with hand and kiss? Considered, unanimously, by the elders, that inasmuch as he was properly received into his office by the church in which he was chosen, he would be sufficiently established?

1871 ART. 14. Is it considered right for a brother in the ministry to exercise his own judgment in reference to remaining in or moving out of the church in which he was chosen, or must he remain in said church or district until the brethren there see proper to let him go? Answer: We consider that it would be best for all ministering brethren, before leaving a church, to counsel it, and it should spare him if it can do so.

1909 ART. 4. Inasmuch as there seems to be much changing and moving from place to place by some of our ministers, for various reasons, and in consequence thereof many local churches are left in a crippled state or condition, and on account of such conditions the church and the surrounding ministry are put to much trouble and much inconvenience thereby, will not the Yearly Meeting of 1909 make it the duty of a minister to first get the consent of his church by the assistance of the adjoining elders, to let him move, so as not to leave it wholly to his own option whether he may move or not? Answer: We, your subcommittee, unitedly agree and endorse the request asked for in the query, that this Yearly Meeting advise that elders and ministers should heed the counsel of elders and the counsel of the church in moving from place to place, and not leave the flock without a minister. The church should hold them responsible to hold their regular appointments until the church is supplied by a competent ministry, and re-adopt the former minutes of 1871, Art. 14. Passed by the meeting.

Ministers Serving On Arbitrations

1842 ART. 6. Whether it be proper for a brother who is elected to speak the word, to serve at arbitrations or on juries, etc.? Considered, as it has been often heretofore, that brethren would do best at all times, if it be avoidable, not to serve, except there is reason to hope that peace may be promoted thereby.

Minister Taking Pay

1866 ART. 41. Is it according to the gospel for members, or any body of members, to pay a stated salary to our ministering brethren, for the support of their families, that they may give themselves wholly to their ministerial labors? Answer: Not wrong to support the ministry, where it is needed. I. Tim. v. 18; Luke x. 7. But we do not approve of paying a stated salary.

Ministry. (Ministers Should Be Called by Church)

1845 ART. 7. How it is considered, if brethren will force themselves into the ministry without consent from the elders, and some of the members encourage them in it? Considered, that inasmuch as it appears by the words of James, chapter iii. 1, by the words of our Savior (John x. 1), and of Paul (Heb. v. 4-7), there is a right way and also a wrong way to enter into the ministry—the wrong way being when one is taking this honor unto himself, and the right way, when one is called of God, by the church, which is the body of Christ, and the order of which calling to the ministry is found described in the Acts of the Apostles. Brethren ought to be very cautious when they feel a desire to preach the gospel, that they do not take the wrong way; rather humble than elevate themselves, and be fully assured that if the Lord wants their services, he has all power in heaven and on earth to bring about their calling to it in the right order and in due time; but if such brethren would still go out of the way, appoint and hold meetings, against the counsel of the church, the church would have to hold them as disobedient members, according to Matt. xvii., and members generally ought to be very careful not to encourage and support such brethren in their disorderly proceedings.

(Special)

1848 ART. 1. Whether a private brother has a right to speak in public meeting? Considered, that, inasmuch as there is a way appointed in the gospel to enter into the ministry, those who feel an inward desire or call to preach, should patiently wait until the church sees fit to appoint them to the public ministry. (See John x. 1, 2; Heb. v. 4, 5; Acts i., etc.)

1858 ART. 53. How is it considered when a brother who is forwarded to the Word as a minister of the first degree, attends meetings, makes appointments, or fills such when made by others who are not members of the church without counseling the church, or ordained brethren when there are such in the district where he was chosen? Considered, that as ministers are the servants of the church, they ought not to do any thing contrary to the will of the church, and when it is convenient they should always consult the church.

1859 ART. 18. Is it considered in order for a ministering brother to refuse to labor at home, while he goes out and fills appointments in neighboring churches? Answer: We consider such a course inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel, but recommend that all such questions be investigated at home, in the churches in which they originate.

Ministry

1860 ART. 7. How is it considered when a brother has been elected to the ministry, but who has never exercised in his office, and who has no confidence in his ability to be useful, asks, after eighteen months from the time he was elected to the office, to be released from serving? Answer: We think the time specified above is too short to try a brother, and we think the brethren had better encourage such a brother to speak and exercise in his office, but let him not be over urged.

1862 ART. 32. Where ministering brethren have difficulties in the church, and when they are not in full fellowship with the church, in breaking bread, etc., may they still continue to preach and appoint meetings? Answer: We consider that such brethren should be reconciled to the church before they make appointments to preach.

1862 ART. 38. If the servants of the church, receiving the office of teaching, and after a while become more worldly in appearance and manner, whose duty is it to admonish them? Is it the duty of any member, or only the duty of the minister? Answer: We consider it to be the duty of any member to admonish such in the spirit of meekness and love.

1863 ART. 8. How is it considered if brethren appoint meetings, and invite speakers from other congregations, who conform themselves too much to the fashions of the world by wearing apparel, and those appointments and invitations are made without the consent of the church or bishop, and are offensive to some members? We think members should not do so without the consent of the elder or the church.

1864 ART. 30. A minister in the first degree moves into another district, and while absent from the first, is advanced to the second degree in the district into which he moved. During this time another brother was chosen to the ministry in the first district, and advanced to the second degree, his election having taken place after the first-named speaker's advancement. Now, the first-named speaker moves back into the first district, after an absence of ten years, with a certificate certifying his good standing in the church in which he had been living. Now, according to the gospel, and the order of the brethren, which of the two is next to the elder or bishop? or does the first brother forfeit his standing by moving away from the flock? Answer: The brother longest in the ministry, if a worthy minister, is next to the elder.

1864 ART. 32. What authority have we in the New Testament for three orders or grades in the ministry? And if there be not three grades, how many are set forth in the word of Christ and the apostles? Answer: We defer this question to the next Annual Meeting, recommending the brethren to examine the scripture upon the subject.

1865 ART. 52. Where is the gospel, either in command, precept, or example, that justifies the idea that there is a first, a second, and a third degree in the ministry? Answer: We have plain scripture to teach a grade of officers in the church. (See Eph. iv. 11): "He gave some, apostles; some, prophets; some, evangelists; and some pastors and teachers."

1866 ART. 17. Is it in accordance with the gospel for ministering brethren, when traveling, to keep and have published a record of their travels, telling how many meetings they attended, how many were converted, who took them from place to place, with whom they stayed over night, besides many little incidents seen by the way, etc.? Answer: We have no gospel command to do so, but if it is done it should be to edification, and a too minute detail of particulars should be avoided, deeming that useless.

1866 ART. 26. What shall the church do with a ministering brother that has promised three times to the church to conform to the order of the church in point of dress and apparel, and the time set for him to do so, but the time expires, and he does not make his promise good, and also influences members against conforming to the rules laid down in the gospel relative to nonconformity to the fashion of the world? Answer: We advise the church having brethren who fail to comply with their promises, as above stated, to deal with them according to Matt. xviii.

1867 ART. 26. What is to be done with the housekeeper in an arm of the church, who neglects to examine the applicant for baptism, as laid down in the minutes of 1848, and republished in the minutes of 1858? Answer: We think the elders of the adjoining churches should visit the housekeeper, and admonish him to proceed according to the order of the brethren, as laid down in the minutes.

1867 ART. 29. Is it consistent with the gospel to apply the term reverend to ministers of other denominations, or to our own brethren, either in speaking or writing? Answer: We consider it not right to do so, since it is applied in the Bible alone to God?

1868 ART. 8. Is it in accordance with the gospel to restrict a brother from preaching that which a branch of the body is permitted to preach and practice, and which is represented at the Annual Meeting from year to year, and is acknowledged as being in full fellowship with the church? Answer: In restricting a brother in his liberty of preaching the gospel, we must not be governed by what any branch of the church may preach or practice, but we must be governed by what a brother preaches, and by the manner in which he preaches. The apostolic precept, "Let all things be done unto edification," is a rule to be observed in preaching as in every thing else.

1868 ART. 23. Is it consistent with the gospel, and the order of the brethren, for our ministers to teach, at our love-feasts, that members are justifiable in absenting themselves from the communion, after they have had their feet washed and partaken of the Lord's Supper? If this is not right, what should be done with members who will do so without giving any reason? Answer: It is wrong to do as intimated above, and more wrong still to teach it, and it should be neither taught nor done.

1869 ART. 8. Shall officers in the church, involved in difficulties, act in their office while involved in such difficulties, and when there are others holding the same office? Answer: We think the case should be first investigated before officers are prohibited from acting in their offices.

1870 ART. 21. Inasmuch as both the district and Yearly Meeting have decided that it is inconsistent with the gospel, and the order of the brethren, for a brother to preach who will not conform to the order of the church, shall not the church have the liberty to take his office from him, if he remains obstinate after being admonished? Answer: We think it shall, after being admonished again and again by the church.

1871 ART. 6. Whereas, the eastern district of Maryland has decided that our colored brother, Elias Fisher, be authorized to preach the gospel to the colored people, and since he was installed there have been exceptions taken to the manner of his promotion, will this Annual Meeting confirm the decision of the eastern district of Maryland? Answer: In relation to the above case, it appears, from what this Annual Meeting has learned, that there has been a failure on the part of the elders in the district to authorize Bro. Fisher to preach, and owing to said failure, a brother in the second degree installed him, by the laying on of hands. As this was a departure from the practice of the church, we think it was very improper; and, while we recognize Bro. Fisher as a minister among us, we consider him only in the first degree, regarding the laying on of hands as conferring no official authority whatever.

1875 ART. 18. Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting has decided that it is inconsistent for brethren that will not conform to the order of the church to preach, are not the elders neglecting a duty in suffering such to go on, and through their influence whole churches become out of order? And while the Annual Council has also decided that it is the duty of the adjoining elders to set such ministers and churches in order, will not this district-meeting and the Annual Meeting urge the brethren to see that the general order of the brethren is more fully carried out? Answer: The southern district of Ohio urges the elders to do so, and this Annual Meeting does the same.

1875 ART. 24. As Christ never published Himself, would it not be better for the brethren traveling and preaching not to publish themselves, in stating how many sermons they preached, and how many persons they baptized; as much as to say: "See what I have done?" Answer: Not advisable to do so.

1876 ART. 15. Is it according to the gospel, and order of the brethren, when a brother is elected to the ministry, and accepts the office, and is installed, and afterward gets disobedient, and says he can not preach, for the church to release him so far that he is not under any obligations to preach only in case he should feel to do so, and thereby help him to live in disobedience, and give him liberty to serve as a deacon, when he was never elected to a deacon's office? If so, let the gospel authority be presented. Answer: We consider it neither according to the gospel nor the order of the brethren to do so.

1877 ART. 1. Will this district meeting petition our Annual Conference to suggest to all the churches, the necessity of restraining brethren from traveling as evangelists among the churches, when said evangelists will not, both by precept and example, faithfully maintain and urge the adoption of the recognized order of the general brotherhood in the matter of dress, including, also, fully the doctrine of non-conformity to the world, as held by our faithful brethren, and thus have each branch of the church watchful in guarding against sowing the seeds of discord among brethren? Answer: We do so petition Annual Meeting. The Annual Meeting grants the foregoing petition of the district meeting.

1877 ART. 5. Is it right, according to the gospel, for our editorial brethren to applaud and eulogize, through their papers, brethren who travel from one congregation to another, upon their success as preachers? Answer: Not right.

1877 ART. 8. A brother has his office taken from him, and he moves to another congregation with his certificate of good standing as a private member. Now, if the congregation where this brother lives, needs help in the ministry, can they re-instate him by the consent of the church, or should he stand his chance with others in an election? Answer: He may be re-instated in his office, but it must be done by the consent of both congregations, the one from which he removed, and the one in which he now resides. And, not interfering with the past action of congregations, in the future, officers who have been deposed must be restored as above and not re-elected.

1878 ART. 4. During the past year we learn from one of our church papers, and otherwise, that a minister in the first degree was promoted to the second degree in the ministry, not by the congregation by which he was elected, but by another, though it was said it was done by the approbation of the congregation which elected him. This congregation decides it was wrong to do so. What says the district meeting? The district meeting adopts the answer of the congregation, and orders it sent to the Annual Meeting. Answer: This Annual Meeting decides that it is wrong to do so.

1878 ART. 14. Is it according to the gospel for a brother to administer the communion if he is not conformed to the order of the church in his apparel and in the wearing of his hair? Answer: It is not just right, and brethren should not do so.

1881 ART. 6. Brethren that have been called to the ministry, and fail to give evidence of their usefulness after a sufficient length of time, should they then be relieved by the church, when they repeatedly request it? Answer: We decide that the church, in such a case, shall do as it judges best.

Missionary (Danish Mission)

1877 ART. 7. The district meeting requests Annual Meeting to inquire into the misionary work now begun in Denmark, and if it thinks it advisable to recommend it to the sympathy and support of the general brotherhood. Answer: Whereas, from what we know of the success of the Danish Mission, we do not grant the request of the Middle District of Pennsylvania The following resolution in regard to the Danish Mission, was also passed by the Annual Meeting:

Resolved, That this Annual Meeting approve of a collection being made, while in session, for the Danish Mission.

1878 ART. 17. Whereas, Annual Meeting has heretofore left the Danish Mission to the care of Northern Illinois, recommending it to the support and sympathy of the entire brotherhood; and whereas, a church has now been fully organized in Denmark, does this Annual Meeting consider it advisable for that church to remain under the care of Northern Illinois, or does it properly belong to the direct care of the Annual Meeting? Answer: The church in Denmark shall be under the care of the Northern District of Illinois, but it is the duty of the whole brotherhood to help defray the expenses, that the said district does not have to bear more than its part or proportion of the expenses that must be met and provided for.

1879 ART. 3. Inasmuch as it was decided by the last Annual Meeting that the expenses of the Danish Mission shall be paid by the general brotherhood, will not the District of Northern Illinois request the Annual Meeting of 1879 to tell each district what its probable portion will be? Answer: We agree to petition the Annual Meeting to grant the above request. Answer, as given by the Annual Meeting: As $800 are needed to meet the expenses of said mission for the present year, this Annual Meeting requests each church in the brotherhood to pay $2.00, the wealthier churches more and the poorer ones less, to make up said amount, that amount from each church being necessary, the money to be sent to the treasurer of the Northern District of Illinois, C. P. Rowland.

1880 ART. 21. Will not this Annual Meeting adopt some means to meet the wants of the Danish Mission, as the advice of Article 3, of the Minutes of 1879, has not met the wants of the past year, because some of the churches have failed to comply with said demand? Answer: Each member of the Standing Committee shall notify each church in his state district that he is appointed to receive what it will contribute to the Danish Mission.

Missionary

1852 ART. 8. Whether the commission of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 15) does not require of the church to send brethren to preach the gospel, where the name of Christ is not known? Considered, that the brethren acknowledge the great commission of Christ to its full extent, and that it is the duty of the church, the ministers, and every private member, to do all that is in their power to fulfill that commission in accordance with apostolic practice.

1853 ART. 12. Could there not much good be done in the noble work of spreading the gospel by advising such brethren wishing to emigrate westward to locate themselves where they are most needed? Considered, that we can do no more but recommend to brethren-teachers moving to the West, to take this into serious consideration.

1856 ART. 22. A letter from Virginia urging that this Yearly Meeting devise a plan how the church could fulfill the command of the Savior (Matt. xxviii. 19) more effectually, so that the article 8, on our Minutes of 1852, should not remain a dead letter. This meeting recommends the subject to the serious consideration of all the churches.

1858 ART. 58. Whereas, there is a strong desire among the brethren in various places to have a more general exertion made on the part of the church to have the truth more universally spread; and, whereas, the subject has been frequently talked of without any definite plan being proposed, we, therefore, have concluded, by way of introduction, to offer the following outlines of a plan, subject, however, to such amendments as may from time to time be thought best; that is, let each state, where there is a respectable number of brethren, form a district; let the brethren there hold their annual meetings; let each of these divisions have its treasury; let the churches that feel favorable, have their treasury; let the churches be called upon as often as may be necessary to cast in their mite as a free-will offering. Then let these contributions be put into the district treasury, and let the district meetings appoint ministering brethren, say two or more, if necessary (such as are willing to go), to travel through the respective states for one year, their expenses being paid, and such provision made for their families as may be thought necessary. What does the Annual Meeting think of this proposition? Considered, that we think it not good to adopt this proposition, but we believe it is a subject worthy the serious and prayerful consideration of the brotherhood, and we recommend the brethren to give it such a consideration.

1859 ART. 28. Seeing the great necessity of having the gospel, as held and practiced by the brethren, more extensively spread and known, we desire that the brethren in this Annual Council reconsider the fifty-eighth article of the minutes of 1858, and adopt it with such amendments as, in the fear of the Lord, may seem best. As it was recommended by the last Annual Meeting to make the subject of spreading the gospel one of prayerful consideration, it appears it was done; and several churches have expressed their wish to this Annual Council meeting to have it take a favorable action upon the subject, the following is the conclusion this Annual Meeting has come to in relation to what is referred to in this article. This meeting recommend and give liberty to any of the districts or states to make a move on the subject of spreading and sustaining the gospel, as preached and understood by the brethren, so that the same may be done in the order of the gospel. And we recommend to those churches which may adopt this to make a report to the next Annual Meeting upon their success. And, in view of the importance of the subject, we appoint the following brethren as a committee to propose some plan by which the brotherhood in general may take a part in this good work; said plan to be reported to the next Annual Meeting: Daniel P. Sayler, John Kline, John H. Umstad, Samuel Layman, John Metzger, and James Quinter. Daniel P. Sayler is the corresponding member of the committee.

1860 ART. 12. Whereas, the brethren in California and Oregon have earnestly desired and requested a delegation of two or three brethren to be sent, by the Annual Council of the brethren, to encourage and strengthen them, and "to set in order the things needed" for a proper organization of churches according to the gospel of Christ, as well as to preach the gospel where Christ is not known. The meeting, therefore, receiving with favor the request, came to the following conclusion concerning the subject: It was decided that the standing committee of this Annual Meeting form a board for the purpose of corresponding with brethren, and of ascertaining if any seem to be called to the work, and of judging of their fitness for it, and for making the necessary arrangements for carrying out the purpose of this Annual Meeting, to comply with the request from the brethren in California and Oregon. And in order to obtain the necessary pecuniary aid, this meeting recommends to all the churches to make contributions for the purpose, and to report to the board the result of their operations. James Quinter, of Columbiana, Columbiana County, Ohio, was appointed corresponding secretary, and Daniel P. Sayler, Double Pipe Creek, Carroll County, Maryland, treasurer.

1861 ART. 7. Contains a remonstrance from the Sugar Creek Church, Allen County, Ohio, as follows: "Having assembled in council, and having under consideration the missionary question, we, the church aforesaid, enter our remonstrance against all plans that have been recommended through the 'Visitor,' save the one on page 279, of September number last." All business upon this subject is referred to the next Yearly Meeting.

1861 ART. 13. Resolved, that we are opposed to a treasury for the executive benefit of the ministry, but that every church should encourage their ministers to be active in their calling, and also to support them in all cases of necessity. Considered, that we fully concur in the sentiment above expressed.

1867 ART. 30. Should not our church adopt some general plan for the spread of the gospel, as the duty is enjoined upon her by the Savior Himself. And does not an efficient plan imply some pecuniary provision? Answer: This Annual Meeting hails the desire to have the gospel spread, and which is growing among the brethren as a favorable indication, and it would encourage this and recommend to the several states to take such measures as a prayerful consideration of the subject would suggest, to engage in this good work; and it would also recommend that such plans be adopted as would suggest themselves by such consideration, since no one plan can now be united upon, hoping that, as the work progresses, and as further light is elicited by reflection, observation, and experience, a greater and more efficient system may be adopted. In the meantime, let whatever is done be done according to the spirit and word of the gospel, as work done in any other way will not be approved by the Lord.

1868 ART. 21. Our Annual Meeting has, on different occasions, decided in favor of adopting some plan for a more extensive spread of the gospel; we, therefore, request this meeting to adopt the plan of the Annual Meeting of 1858, Art. 58, or some other one. Answer: This meeting adopts the report presented to the Annual Meeting of 1860. The following is the report referred to: "The committee appointed at the Annual Meeting of 1859, Art. 28, to propose some plan to the present meeting, by which the brotherhood in general may take some part in the good work of the Lord, in preaching the gospel more generally, reports as follows: Whereas, the preaching of the gospel to every creature is a command of Christ, since he said to his disciples, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature' (Mark xvi. 15), and, therefore, a duty enjoined upon all His disciples, hence it needs no argument in its defense. The only point to be considered, is: "How shall it be done? Now, St. Paul says: 'Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges?' (I. Cor. ix. 7); and as the Lord Jesus gave every man his work, as well as his servants authority (Mark xiii. 34): 'For the Son of Man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work,' it is therefore, evident that he did not mean that His ministering servants should be burdened with the duty of preaching His word, and also bearing the expenses incurred in traveling from place to place, while all the members of the body remain idle. The committee understands the Lord Jesus to mean that the church, His body on earth (I. Cor. xii. 27), shall, unitedly, preach His gospel in all the world, by the ministry, through the Holy Ghost; and, therefore, the church should pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers; for so Jesus commanded His disciples, saying: 'The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few; pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into His harvest.' Matt. 9. 37, 38. And it appears from the following account, in Acts xix. 2, 3, that this was the practice of the apostolic church: 'As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.' And, in view of the above considerations, the committee offers the following advice: That the churches of the brotherhood form themselves into districts, the brethren in those districts to meet, as often as they may judge it necessary, to transact their business; that each of said districts have its treasury, and each one of the churches which form said districts have its treasury, the former to be supplied out of the latter, and the latter to be supplied by weekly contributions, as directed by the Apostle Paul (I. Cor. xvi. 2), 'Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come,' a plan for raising pecuniary funds, of divine appointment, and is one which commends itself to our acceptance, both from its authority and excellency. And in order that the funds collected may be the most judiciously, satisfactorily, and economically applied, we advise that each sub-district or church appoint at least one delegate to attend the general district-meetings, and that these meetings so dispose of the funds collected as they shall judge most conducive to the glory of God and the salvation of souls. And in order to preserve a proper harmony between all the congregations of the brotherhood, we further advise that each general district-meeting send a delegate to the Annual Meeting, and, by the delegate, a report of its proceedings, that all such proceedings may be in harmony with the regulations, as made by the brethren assembled in Annual Council, and subject to the inspection and control of that body. And in case any demands of a general character for evangelists are made, sufficiently so to require the action of the Annual Meeting, then, in that case, the funds needed to defray the expenses of said evangilists shall be drawn from the treasuries of the several districts. And, as the conviction of mind seems to be general among the brethren, that greater exertion should be made by the brotherhood to have the gospel preached in every place, the committee would remind the ministry that the foregoing plan is by no means designed to supersede the labors of our ministers in their individual capacities. But we recommend to all our preachers to labor as they have been acustomed to do, without money and without price, as far as their circumstances will permit them to do so, showing, as they have hitherto done in a remarkable degree, the Christian grace of self-denial — a grace which shone brightly in the life of our divine Master, and which occupies a prominent place in His teaching. We further recommend to all our preachers to submit the above plan to their congregations, hoping that it will meet with their acceptance. All of which is respectfully submitted by the committee: D. P. Sayler, John Kline, John Metzger, James Quinter."

1871 ART. 7. Should not this district adopt measures to provide and supply ministerial aid for churches where there is no preacher? and also to fill calls, open missions, preach the gospel, and introduce the principles of the brethren in the many sections within said district, which they have not yet reached? Answer: This Annual Meeting approves of the suggestions in the above query, as it is very necessary that churches or bodies of brethren, in which there are no resident ministers, should be assisted; and inasmuch as there are many localities where the gospel, as preached and practiced by the brethren, is not known, we think the gospel should be taken into such places. As it regards the measures necessary to accomplish these objects, we think the district should adopt such measures as it judges best calculated to answer its purpose.

[NOTE—This query came to the Annual Meeting without any answer. It was the duty of the standing committee to form an answer to it, and submit said answer to the General Council. The above answer was accordingly formed and submitted to the committee, and received the unanimous vote of the committee. But owing to the fact that it was not answered, it was deferred, when first introduced, and was afterward overlooked. It then occurred to the mind of the clerk that it had been overlooked, and he regretted it very much. Having an opportunity to do so he mentioned the circumstances to several of the standing committee after the meeting closed, and they thought it might be put on the minutes. We accordingly insert it, not as having received the sanction of the General Council, but that of the standing committee.—Clerk.]

1873 ART. 27. Is it according to the gospel for council districts to select brethren from among their ministers and send them to preach the gospel in places where there are no ministering brethren, and where people desire the brethren to preach, and to pay the traveling expenses of such brethren? Answer: It is according to the gospel, and the decisions of the Annual Meeting? (See Minutes of 1868, Art. 21.)

1874 ART. 18. Since the Macedonian call is heard from many places over the land, and as the gospel says, "go," and as the Annual Meeting of 1868 has formed a plan, will not this Annual Meeting of 1874 perfect the plan and carry it into effect? Answer: We can not see how we can make a more perfect plan than the one referred to in the query, but we request the churches having such calls to make arrangements to carry out said plan.

1875 ART. 20. Inasmuch as the church has manifested a little of the missionary spirit during last year, in sending brethren to the State of Kentucky, we respectfully petition that brethren be sent to the northern part of Alabama and Tennessee adjoining, to build up and to comfort the body of brethren gathered together a few years since under the labors of A. J. Hixson. The number of members was about twenty-five. Answer: In regard to the petition for brethren to visit and preach in Alabama, we would say, we favor the idea, and appoint the following brethren as a committee to attend to the case: B. F. Moomaw, S. Z. Sharp, and H. Garst.

1879 ART. 17. We, the Elk Lick congregation, ask the district meeting to instruct the delegates to Annual Meeting to urge the mission-work of evangelism upon said body, and that they be instructed to use all fair means to have the Annual Meeting accept and encourage the work. This was agreed to by the Western District of Pennsylvania. Deferred by Annual Meeting.

1880 ART. 3. A request from the Western District of Pennsylvania to call up and protect the petition of that district sent up to the Annual Meeting of 1879, urging the work of evangelism upon said meeting, and instructing the delegates to use all fair means to have the Annual Meeting to accept and encourage said work, but which was deferred by the Annual Meeting of 1879. Upon the presentation of the above request, the following resolution was offered and passed by the Annual Meeting:

Resolved, That we appoint a committee of five, whose duty it shall be to present a plan that will harmonize with other plans that have been favored by Annual Meeting, and the one now in operation among us; but Annual Meeting shall not be financially responsible for any plan.

The committee reported the following plan, which was adopted by the Annual Meeting: 1. We recommend this Annual Meeting to appoint five brethren, sound in the faith and fully alive to our missionary interests, to superintend the domestic and foreign missionary work of the general brotherhood. 2. That those five brethren appoint out of their number such officers (corresponding secretary, treasurer, etc.,) as the nature of the work requires. 3. That the brethren be instructed to interfere in no way with any present individual church or district missionary efforts among our brethren. 4. That Annual Meeting advise that any domestic or foreign mission-work of a general nature, like the Danish Mission, now under the care of district council, be committed to the supervision of this Board.

5. That this meeting recommend that the fund now in the hands of the "Brethren's Work of Evangelism," be committed to the treasury of the board of the General Conference. 6. That this Board be instructed to proceed no further in its appointments, etc., than the means in its treasury will justify. 7. That the officers of this Board be required to make an official report of their work, its condition, operation, and wants, to each session of our General Conference, and that said report go into our regular minutes. 8. That every church in the brotherhood be requested to appoint a solicitor in its own congregation to raise funds for this work, and forward the same to the treasurer of this mission board at least every six months. 9. That this Board be instructed to proceed to its work at once, as opportunity permits. 10. That the Standing Committee of Annual Meeting be required to fill any vacancy that may occur in the Board from time to time, and that its members be elected every four years. J. W. Stein, John Metzger, Hiel Hamilton, J. D. Livengood, J. W. Fitzgerald, committee. In connection with the foregoing, the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That the Danish Mission be transferred to the Domestic and Foreign Mission Board.

1881 ART. 24. Inasmuch as the Foreign and Domestic Mission is causing trouble and confusion in the Church of the Brethren, we ask Annual Meeting to consider all its decisions on this subject since 1868, Article 21, and to readopt the decision of that year. We do re-adopt the decision of 1868, but to save the Danish Mission and the arrangement of 1880 from being disorganized, we leave them stand at least one year.

1881 ART. 30. With regard to the missionary plan, with its Board of Directors, etc., we are not in full harmony with, and therefore offer the following: That we ask Annual Meeting of 1881, through district meeting, to recall said decision of last year, in which we fear a paid ministry is encouraged, and urge it earnestly upon the brotherhood to be more actively engaged in spreading the truth amongst us and to all as much as can be done, but in a more simple manner, after the pattern and advice of the church as given us heretofore. Answer: This question was deferred.

(Recon. Min.)

1883 SEC. 5. MISSIONARY. All on the missionary queries refused, but we endorse the resolutions and petition upon gospel order. We advise ministers to be actively engaged in meeting the many calls for having the gospel preached, and advise the members also to encourage them to go; and that they show thereby a willingness to extend a helping hand in bearing the expenses of the ministry, to go and assist those who ask for the help in the church work. **No treasury in the hands of a board,** leaving the church have the exclusive oversight, to meet **every** emergency, alluring none to preach for the sake of money. [See resolutions. Section 8.] (Accepted.)

1893 ART. 1. The Beaver Creek Church of Wisconsin, petitions the Annual Meeting of 1893 to provide some plan by which the isolated churches could be visited more frequently and have more preaching. Answer: This meeting recommends the following: If calls are made to any local church, and said church is not able to meet the call or calls, we advise that said church inform the neighboring churches, and so meet all the necessary demands which may be made from isolated parts.

1902 ART. 2. We petition the Yearly Meeting of 1902 to approve of some plan by which all the isolated members could have a visit at least once a year, and enjoy the privilege of having a few meetings, and have the Gospel preached to them, believing much good could be done, members be encouraged, and sinners be warned. Answer: We think that this petition asks for more than can be reached at this time, and feel to refer to the decision of Yearly Meeting of 1893, Art. 1. But we recommend a more active work of the ministry.

1910 ART. 6. Will not the Yearly Meeting of 1910 urge brethren when they get calls, to adhere more strictly to Art. 1 of the Yearly Meeting of 1893? Answer: We, your sub-committee, decide to grant the request of the petitioners. Passed by the meeting.

1934 ART. 12. Inasmuch as we have no system at present for caring for the isolated churches, but whenever they have brethren to come to their assistance, either at communion meetings or regular meetings, that the local church is expected to bear those brethren's expenses which is causing quite a burden on many of our isolated churches, as usually their membership is small and often are a considerable distance from the main Brotherhood. A number of these local churches have only one minister and some are without any minister, and usually only have brethren to come to them once a year. Therefore we earnestly pray Yearly Meeting of 1934 to seriously consider this condition as it now exists, and ask that Standing Committee select three or five brethren to be approved by Yearly Meeting as a committee to formulate some plan whereby these isolated churches could have more meetings by brethren coming to them and would be relieved of bearing all the expenses. This committee then report their plan to Yearly Meeting of 1935 for its acceptance.

Answer: Request of query granted and Brethren Ezra Denlinger, Enos Eikenberry and John C. Bowser appointed as a committee to formulate a plan whereby the isolated churches can be reached. Approved by the meeting.

Report of Committee on Plan for Sending Ministers To Isolated Churches

1935 To the Annual Meeting of 1935, Greeting: Inasmuch as Annual Meeting of 1934 has appointed us as a committee to formulate a plan by which all isolated churches might be more frequently reached with ministerial aid, and that their expenses might be paid by other churches, or by the Brotherhood; in view of the above request we your committee have made strong efforts to unite on some plan; but by a careful study of our former Minutes and Resolutions, we find it very difficult to formulate a plan that will not conflict with the same, therefore we could not unitedly agree on a certain plan. Nevertheless, we will submit the following for your consideration:

We are made to feel the great responsibility that we, as a committee, are placed under when we consider the great need of those isolated churches. On the other hand, when we consider the Resolutions, page 39, appendix of Minute Book, which we do not wish to ignore (for we believe the brethren who wrote them felt in their very hearts to stop all missionary plans or mission boards as then granted by Annual Meeting); yet we are made to feel that they did not feel to stop the work entirely if rightly carried out.

For further evidence, see Resolutions in appendix of Minute Book, page 40, which reads as follows: "We are by no means opposed to mission-work, if carried out in gospel order. Neither are we opposed to assist our poor ministers in such work."

For further consideration we refer to the latter part of Section 5 of Reconsidered Minutes, appendix of Minute Book, page 4, which reads, "—No treasury in the hands of a board." To this we heartily agree, but suggest that it be put in the hands of the church, that the church may have the exclusive oversight. With these thoughts under consideration, we offer the following plan to the Annual Meeting of 1935 for consideration:

Inasmuch as the query asked assistance only for isolated churches, hence let it be agreed and understood that this plan only applies to states named: North Dakota, Wisconsin, Iowa, northern Illinois, Colorado, Oklahoma, Florida, West Virginia, and Canada.

First. Let the elders in charge of the isolated churches of afore named states and Canada, together with the council of said churches, call on ministering brethren whom they may desire—limiting them to two or not more than three calls per year, and taking into consideration the distance and expense—in other words confine their calls to brethren the nearest to them as much as convenient, and if for any reason brethren called could not go, then instead of them sending some one in their place, let the church as before, say whom they desire.

As to other churches of the remaining part of the Brotherhood, that are somewhat isolated, we could advise that our ministers should visit such churches more frequently, and also other members who are financially able to assist in taking ministers to such churches, or in helping otherwise to meet their expenses.

Second. For collecting money to bear the expense of those ministers who are called to those isolated churches who are not able financially to bear their own expense:

(1) Let the Brotherhood be divided into two districts: Ohio and Eastern, Indiana and Western, including Michigan.

(2) Let the elders in charge of the local churches of each named district ask (beginning with one of the above named districts and when their contribution is spent, then each of the above named districts in turn thereafter) their congregations to contribute to the cause. Every man according as he purposes in his heart, so let him give.

Third. Let the Standing Committee of 1935 select a brother, to be approved by the Brotherhood, whose duty it shall be to notify through The Vindicator each district when its contribution is needed, and to take charge of said money given by the Brotherhood, and to make such payment to brethren that are called as to further statement of their expenses to and from the churches. Also to keep a full record of all money received and paid out, and render a full statement each year to the Brotherhood through The Vindicator.

Fourth. Let the ministering brethren that have been called by those isolated churches make a full report of their expenses to and from the meeting, and if said church feels to pay part of the expense, let it be so stated by the elder in charge, and inserted in statement. Likewise, if said ministers feel to bear part of their expenses, let them also make a statement of the same and send full statement to the brother in charge of money contributed by the Brotherhood, and he shall refund to full amount per statement rendered. It is further agreed and understood that no brother shall be paid his expenses to and from isolated churches that has not been called by said church, or any one accompanying said brother or brethren.

It is further understood that this plan does not prohibit any ministering brother to offer his services to those churches by bearing his own expenses to and from the meeting, if he feels able so to do, but it rather encourages all ministers who are any wise able financially to assist those churches as much as possible in their isolated condition.

Tenderly Submitted

Ezra Denlinger,
Enos Eikenberry,
John C. Bowser.

The above report was accepted by the Meeting.

Brother Alfred Brubaker was appointed to take charge of the work as required in section third of the report.

Moderators and Clerks

1877 ART. 25. We, the brethren and sisters of Barren Ridge, would ask the district meeting of Virginia, No. 2, and Annual Meeting, to favor us with a frequent change in moderators and clerks, as it is thought it would give better satisfaction to both district and Annual Meeting to do so. This district meeting approves of the above-named change, and asks the sanction of the Annual Meeting to it. Answer: This Annual Meeting sanctions the change.

Moving Unreconciled

1849 ART. 13. When a member offends in a church, and moves away without being reconciled, can he obtain a certificate by writing, without personally presenting himself? Considered, when a member removes, under such circumstances, and is so far away, or situated unfavorably for coming back to make reconciliation, when he wishes to do so, if the church from which he removed is satisfied with his acknowledgment, made in writing, it may signify this satisfaction in a letter to the church where he resides.

Musical Instruments

1852 ART. 11. Has a brother a right to have or keep in his house costly musical instruments? Considered, that members could lay out their money to a better advantage.

1857 ART. 10. How is it considered for brethren, and especially ministering brethren, to adorn their children with earrings, breast-pins, finger-rings, and jewelry in general, and send them from home to have them taught music, and to procure pianos for them? Answer: Brethren should not do so.

1866 ART. 34. Is it considered conforming to the world for ministering brethren, or others, to have musical instruments, such as melodeons, pianos, etc., in their houses, and for their children, who are members of the church, to spend their precious time in playing on such instruments? Answer: Considered, that it is tending too much in that direction, the world being largely engaged in it, and we have no example in the New Testament that it was ever indulged in by Christians. Yet, if strictly confined to sacred music, we can not positively prohibit it, but advise all the beloved members to deny themselves of this indulgence, believing that it is attended with dangerous consequences.

1870 ART. 23. Is it right for brethren or sisters to have musical instruments in their houses, such as melodeons or organs? Answer: We think it not expedient to have them in our houses, when they cause offense, and we think, under such circumstances, every brother and sister that have them ought to be admonished, in love, to put them away, agreeably to Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16; James v. 13.

1872 ART. 12. Is it according to the gospel, and the order of the brethren, for members of the church to teach instrumental music in public schools, or elsewhere? We desire the dear brethren, assembled in district-meeting, to give us an answer on the subject. Answer: Whereas, we know of no direct Scripture on the subject, we can only give our advice on the query. And as we believe instrumental music to be of the world, and not of the true church of God, we think members had better not engage in teaching it. But we submit our answer to the Annual

Meeting. This Annual Meeting confirms this answer.

1873 ART. 15. Is it agreeable with the gospel, or the old order of the brethren, for members to have musical instruments in their houses, such as organs or a fiddle, for their amusement, or for the amusement of the young people, and to play on them on the Lord's-day, after they return from worship? Answer: We think it unauthorized by the gospel, and clearly opposed to the order of the old brethren, and the doctrine of self-denial, and not calculated to promote vital Christianity.

1874 ART. 26. Inasmuch as the use of musical instruments among us has caused considerable trouble, and as decisions of Annual Meetings are differently construed, will not this Annual Meeting, therefore, give us such a decision that will fully authorize the different branches of the church to keep them out of the brotherhood, and get those out that are already among us? Answer: The decision of the last Annual Meeting upon the subject of musical instruments is readopted.

1877 **ART. 14. Inasmuch as the** Annual Meeting has decided that it is wrong for members to have and use musical instruments in their houses, what is to be done with members that will not put them away? Can we make it a test of church fellowship? And what shall be done with elders that justify musical instruments, and consequently make no effort to put them out of their congregations? Answer: Inasmuch as the use of musical instruments has been the cause of trouble among our brethren in some places, and has been frequently brought before the Annual Meeting, we would readopt the decision of 1873, and advise our brethren to put them away where they cause offense and trouble in the church; and members who would not do so should fall under the judgment of the church. And as many of our brethren have them where it is not opposed by their church, and as the evil of them is more in the improper use of them than in the instrument itself, we can not decide the simple keeping and use of such musical instruments shall be made a test of fellowship. The great evil being in the improper use of them and in the trouble they produce, we advise the brethren to be careful to avoid offense and trouble by keeping them when they wound the brethren, and elders should be dealt with as transgressors when they encourage the brethren to do so.

(Recon. Min).

1883 SEC. 8. MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS. The resolutions are very decidedly opposed to organs, pianos, melodeons, etc.—

a worldly custom. Minutes are indefinite and confusing, lame in judgment touching offenses. They do not become a meek and lowly follower of Jesus Christ, fail to cultivate self-denial and sobriety, with shamefacedness, according to the simplicity of the gospel and order of the brethren; they please the carnal mind, contrary to our promise of baptism. [See James v. 13; Eph. v. 19.] Reject all minutes and endorse resolutions. (Accepted.)

1920 ART. 1. Inasmuch as the modern invention and use of the talking machines, such as victrolas and many other like machines, are very popular in the world and seem to be slyly creeping into the church, thereby endangering our nonconformity principles, can not this Yearly Meeting give a definite answer to the following question: Is it according to the life of Christ and his teaching for members to use such instruments in their homes? Answer: No. Passed.

1920 ART. 2. While the Resolutions of the Old German Baptist Church say, no musical instruments allowed in her communion or membership, will it not be much more necessary to not allow at all those useless idols—victrolas, phonographs, graphophones, talking and singing machines of all modern inventions and descriptions—and will we not say that we cannot allow them at all to be owned or used in the families of our members? See Rom. 8:6; I Thess. 5:22; Gal. 5:24; 2 Tim. 4:4. Answer: Unanimously decided to grant request. See Rom. 12:2; Titus 2:12; I Peter 4:3, 4. Passed.

1920 ART. 3. First, is it according to the Gospel and the order of the general brotherhood for an elder or for elders or any member to prefer a charge against another and then either of them commune or anoint or be sent as messengers before reconcitation is made? See Matt. 5:23, 24.

Second, can a brother that says we cannot have a communion in our district be a representative of the same as a messenger, and at the same time saying he will not commune not being satisfied with A. M.? Answer: To first part, No. To second part, likewise, No. Passed.

Mustaches

1882 ART. 6. Will the district meeting request the Annual Meeting to explain the clause in the resolutions, and say what is meant by "fashionable mustaches?" The district meeting grants the above request. Answer: We regard the term referred to as applying to the general worldly custom of wearing the beard on the upper lip, since it has become a general worldly fashion to do so. We advise in this case, as the old brethren have always done, that we refrain from all appearance of evil and pride and adhere to the order of the church, so as to give no offense to any of our dear members. (See also minutes of 1866, Book I., Article 27.

Mustering (Military)

1785 ART. 2. Further it was discussed, and unanimously considered, that no brother should permit his sons to go on the muster ground, much less that a brother go himself.

1817 ART. 5. Whether brethren or their children may go on the muster-ground or not? The counsel was, that no member may go there, and prevent also their children from going on that ground, and not willingly permit it to them as long as they are under parental authority; should a brother do so, he could not be in full fellowship with the church; for the Savior said to Peter, "Put up thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword."

1822 ART. 15. Whether a brother may take the liberty to go on the muster ground or take part in the festivities of Independence-day? Considered that no brother should take the liberty to go to such places.

1835 ART. 7. How is it considered when brethren go to muster and drill. Considered, that it is contrary to our baptismal vow, contrary to the word of God, and contrary to the professed principle of the church, and can by no means be permitted or tolerated.

1840 ART. 9. Whether it could be allowed for brethren to go to train (or muster) in the militia? Considered, that training or mustering is a preparation for war, and since we are inclined to peace and a defenseless state, it would in no wise be proper nor allowable for brethren to learn war. Is. ii. 4; Mic. iv. 3.

1859 ART. 23. In those states where muster fines are high, and where the fines are the only means whereby the military musters are kept up, would it not be better for brethren to muster a few times and thereby cause the military system to be abolished, than to pay an oppressive fine and thereby keep up the regimental muster? Answer: It would not, inasmuch as our Lord and Savior teaches non-resistance in gospel throughout. And when we go to musters we there learn the art of war, and the most appropriate method of shedding our fellow-creatures' blood. (See II. Cor. vi. 17; John xviii. 36.)

1863 ART. 1. How are we to deal with our brethren who have enlisted and gone to the army as soldiers or teamsters, or those who have been drafted, and are gone to the army? We think it not expedient to consider (or discuss) these questions at this time. Still it is believed, and was expressed, the gospel gave sufficient instruction.

1863 ART. 17. What plan will the Yearly Meeting recommend or adopt, that all the brethren must bear an equal share in paying the fines government will impose upon those brethren who may be drafted into the military service? In this case it is recommended by this Yearly Meeting that each member should be willing to contribute according to the true avails of their property, according to Gal. vi. 2.

1865 ART. 7. Whereas, the brethren at our last Annual Meeting decided that "Civil Government is of divine authority" (minutes of Annual Meeting, Article 23, 1864); and, whereas, all civil governments are, and always have been, sustained by the sword; we therefore wish to know if it is right for brethren to bear arms, when called upon to do so by the authorities, in order to sustain the civil government? Answer: We consider that we have no right to take up arms.

1865 ART. 15. Can a brother be held as a member of the church who will, when put into the army, take up arms and aim to shed the blood of his fellow-man? Answer: He can not.

1865 ART. 19. How is it considered if a brother who is drafted hires a substitute to perform military service, and afterward removes into another district—shall the church grant him a certificate of membership? Answer: Since the law has exempted brethren from military duty, by paying a tax in lieu of service, we consider that brethren do wrong to resort to other means, unless they are ignorant of the provisions of the law.

1865 ART. 24. How will the brethren, assembled in Annual Council, consider the case where elders and ministers have taken sides with the rebels in this bloody rebellion, and voted for separation; can they be held as divine teachers, or not? Answer: They can not, according to the gospel.

1865 ART. 25. Is it consistent with the gospel to retain members in the church who have voluntarily aided and abetted in the rebellion by voting for separation, or by otherwise encouraging it? Answer: No; such should be put away from among us.

Name of Our Fraternity

1836 ART. 6. What should be the name of our fraternity, when a title for a meeting-house is made and recorded in the public offices? Unanimously concluded to call ourselves the Fraternity of German Baptists.

1871 ART. 36 Would it not be more consistent with the gospel for the brethren to adopt a definite name in writing letters of recommendations? Answer: We think it would be good to head all letters of recommendation as follows: "We, the German Baptist Brethren send greeting."

(Recon. Min.)

1883 SEC. 20. CERTIFICATES of membership. The former decision upon this subject we retain, and from this forward we advise to supply the word "old" in connection with the title "German Baptist." This feature not to be omitted in certificates.

Nearest Friends in Council

1817 ART. 3. Whether the nearest friends of a member that falls under the censure of the church, or a candidate wishing to be received into the church, may be present at the council of the case? Considered necessary that the nearest friends should withdraw.

1832 ART. 7. Whether at a council concerning candidates for baptism, their nearest friends should withdraw. Decided as before.

1838 ART. 8. Whether in case a member falls into the judgment of the church, the nearest relation should withdraw while the council is taken? It has always been considered best to let such relations withdraw.

1874 ART. 11. Will the Annual Meeting state what relations are meant by "nearest relations," in the minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1838, Art. 8? Answer: By "nearest relations," is meant father and mother, brother and sister, son and daughter, and husband or wife of the accused.

1881 ART. 29. Will this district meeting ask Annual Meeting to grant relatives, as defined by Annual Meeting of 1874, Article 11, the same privilege as granted to the accused in Annual Meeting of 1878, Article 6, as asking them to be satisfied with a pending case before they hear it, often fails to give satisfaction. Answer: Annual Meeting decides that the relatives shall have the same privilege the accused have.

Nonconformity

(See Conformity, Also Fashionable Garments)

1846 ART. 10. About pride, in its various forms, which is creeping into the church, it is thought highly necessary that the Yearly Meeting instruct and urge it upon all the overseers of the churches to see especially to that matter, and protest strongly against all manner of superfluity and vanity, such as building fine houses, and having paintings, carpetings, and costly furniture, etc., together with the adorning of the body too much after the fashion of the world. We believe that we should deny ourselves, and abstain from these things, especially the laborers in the Word, who are called to be ensamples of the flock.

1870 ART. 18. How is it considered for members to argue that the old order of the brethren, in wearing a plain garment, is the tradition of men, and say there is no scripture for such order? Answer: We consider it wrong for members to do so, and if they persist in such a course they should be admonished. See I Pet. 5:5. I John 2:16.

1871 ART. 33. What course should be taken to bring into order an individual arm of the church, which is much out of order in regard to wearing of apparel, and implicated with the world in attending school exhibitions, and debates, so that their influence extends into neighboring churches, causing trouble there? Answer: We consider it the duty of the elders of the surrounding churches to take notice of such churches, and set them in order.

1876 ART. 8. Why does the church, after exacting a promise of non-conformity to the world in appearance as a condition of membership, accept brethren as participants in the deliberations of the Annual Meeting who disregard this solemn promise? Answer: No brother ought to be permitted to speak in public at our Annual Meetings who will dress after the fashion of the world.

Nonconformity to World

1876 ART. 21. Is it wrong for sisters to wear fashionable hats instead of bonnets? and where is the Scripture forbidding the wearing of such hats? Answer: We decide it is wrong according to Rom. xii. 2; I. Tim. ii. 9.

1877 ART. 3. Shall Brother Hope receive into the church members who do not comply with our mode of dress, but comply with all other requirements, their dress being even more simple than ours? Answer: This District Meeting decides that all who are received into the church in Denmark shall be received with the promise to conform to the order of the church with regard to dress, as laid down by the brethren in America.

1877 ART. 16. How is it considered by the brethren in Annual Council in regard to sisters wearing fashionable hats while surrounding the communion-table? Can the officiating brother consistently break the bread to such? Answer: Inasmuch as there has been advantage taken of the decision of Annual Meeting of 1876, on the subject of sisters wearing fashionable hats; we hence decide that the sisters shall not wear any hats at all at communion meetings or at any other time, and our brethren should not break the bread of communion to a sister with a hat upon her head, and elders or ministers who encourage and allow sisters to wear hats should be promptly dealt with as transgressors.

1878 ART. 5. How is it considered, and what shall be done with a minister who travels from one place to another over the brotherhood, using his influence against the order of the church. by promising outsiders that if they unite with the church they need not wear the covering worn by the sisters, and that they can wear their hats, etc.? Also telling them they can be baptized and hold their membership with the church where he lived, and where such things are allowed? Answer: The church where a minister is known to be guilty of such wrong in public or in private speaking, shall **take the testimony against him,** and send it in writing to the church in which he has his membership; and if that church will not stop him from going among other churches and using his influence against the order of the Brethren, then the elders of the adjoining churches shall be notified of the fact, and if they will not stop him, the church in which he has been guilty of such things, shall call for a committee from Annual Meeting and said committee shall go to the church in which the offense has been committed, and call for the offending minister to meet them there, and they shall try his case as if they were in his own church, and if they find him guilty of such rebellion against the order of the general brotherhood, they shall **take** his office from him, and notify his church at home of the fact, unless he gives evidence of repentance and reformation.

1880 ART. 14. Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting decided in 1872, Article 5, that the gospel is a perfect law to govern the church in all things necessary to salvation, is it contrary, therefore, to the perfect law of the gospel for sisters to wear MODEST hats? If so, give the scripture forbidding sisters to wear them, and the gospel authority for enforcing them to wear bonnets. Answer: Inasmuch as the wearing of hats by our sisters is following the fashions of the world, it is in violation of the apostle's precept, "Be not conformed to the world" (Rom. xii. 2), and of the following: "Abstain from all appearance of evil" (I. Thess. v. 22), and again, "Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever, therefore, will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God." (James iv. 4.)

1881 ART. 10. Inasmuch as there is a growing tendency to disregard the order of the church in regard to wearing apparel, what would be the best way to stop the evil; or what should be done with elders who do not enforce them? Answer: This question was deferred.

1881 ART. 21. WHEREAS, There is much dissatisfaction expressed by many because of the inconsistencies they see in the general brotherhood in the matter of wearing hats by the sisters, some localities being compelled by committees and decisions of annual conference to make it a test of fellowship by which many have been expelled from the church, while other localities or districts are admitting that for which others are being expelled, hence the just cause for complaining of inconsistencies in the brotherhood. We therefore ask this district meeting to say whether the wearing of hats by the sisters shall be made a test of fellowship; if so, to see that the same be enforced in all places in the brotherhood, thereby removing the inconsistencies referred to.

Inasmuch as the annual conference has decided that sisters shall not wear hats, elders and officers should see that this decision is carried out. Answer: Elders who do not do so shall be dealt with as transgressors.

1896 ART. 3. Inasmuch as we have no advice from Annual Meeting whether it be right or wrong to wear, or put on gold in filling or plating teeth, or crown or clasp for the same, or wearing or adorning of gold, is it right, according to 1 Timothy ii. 9, and 1 Peter iii. 3, 4. Answer: We would advise our members, according to the gospel, not to put on or wear gold in any form whatever, so as to be seen by the public, according to 1 Tim. ii. 9, and 1 Peter iii. 3. 4.

1917 ART. 3. Inasmuch as our country has gone into warfare and has taken up the draft law in order to raise its armies, will not this Yearly Meeting advise our dear members, especially the young, their duty as non-resistant and non-combatant followers of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ who has given us a pattern that we should follow after in our pilgrimage here below? And is it deemed advisable to abide by the law so as to register when the census is taken of the men that come under the draft age? Answer: We, your sub-committee, agree to grant the request in the fore part of this query. As to the latter part of the query, we think it necessary to register as demanded by the law. Passed.

1918 ART. 1. Will not this Y. M. consider the impropriety of our sisters cutting their bonnets flaring in front instead of straight down, the former being a growing custom among our sisters? Will not this Y. M. outline and establish the order that there may be unity of practice and principle? Answer: We, your sub-committee, refer you to Art. 2, 1883 as a sufficient answer to above query. Passed.

1921 ART. 4. Inasmuch as union was the object of the Old Brethren in the Separation, and as the majority ran away with things which we could not consent to, we resolved to adhere to a plain and decent uniformity of dress as soldiers of King Immanuel, that the brethren wear a plain, round breasted coat with standing collar. Now some of our brethren are getting a new style, named by some, "College Coat," which said brethren did not get from patterning after our forefathers, but by copying after other denominations that are drifting worldward, which we think is not in harmony with our humble profession, and is causing offense. How can we best get rid of these? Answer: This A. M. agrees to advise the congregation to ask the members to conform to the order as set forth in the Resolutions of 1881, on page 39, Appendix, Book of Minutes.

1924 ART. 1. First: Inasmuch as it was generally understood that A. M. unanimously granted all requests asked for in query, Art. 3, of 1923, whereas the answer does not grant the requests referring to former minutes to be restricted to order, but makes null and void the further requests touching late fashions referred to by saying: "And we feel we have sufficient on the minutes," thereby cutting out said last requests entirely which were not on the minutes, hence encouraging them as well as hindering elders and house-keepers to restrict them to order as requested in latter clause of the query, as well as things referred to on the minutes previous to that time. This no doubt occurred because of not distinguishing between sub-committee's answer and the final conclusion of A. M. to unanimously grant all the requests.

Therefore we pray this A. M. to reconsider the answer to Art. 3 of 1923 and make null and void said answer for the above reasons being so complicated, and grant all the requests asked for, and the same to be put on the minutes.

Furthermore from henceforth let all conclusions of A. M. be written and then read before the open council.

Second: Inasmuch as many members believe that Art. 3 of 1923 was passed on the last proposition put before the meeting, and whereas the answer to said query does not harmonize with said proposition, we therefore ask this yearly meeting to carefully reconsider Art. 3, of 1923 and answer same in harmony with the Gospel and the established order of the Brotherhood.

Answer: This meeting grants all the requests in the query of Article 3 of 1923 instead of the answer of the sub-committee which was passed last year. Further, All answers to queries shall be read before the open council before they are passed upon. Passed.

1928 ART. 2. We request the Annual Meeting to strongly advise brethren to wear the cape on the overcoat, also to wear the beard, as it seems we are losing out on these two points of church order, especially in some localities. Official brethren should set an example in all matters of non-conformity to the world, and adhere to the adopted uniform and order of the church. See Rom. 12:2; 1 Thess. 1:4 to 8; 1 Peter 5:1 to 4; and A. M. Min. 1888, Art. 1; 1900, Art. 5; 1913, Art. 2. Answer: We agree to readopt Article 2, of 1913 with instruction to the elders to strongly admonish their local congregations on the cape overcoat and the beard. Passed.

Nonresistance

1845 Art. 5. In regard to our being altogether defenseless, not to withstand the evil, but overcome evil with good, the brethren considered, that the nearer we follow the bright example of the Lamb of God, who willingly suffered the cross, and prayed for his enemies; who though heir of all things, had on earth not where to lay his head—the more we shall fulfill our high calling and obtain grace to deny ourselves for Christ's and his gospel's sake, even to the loss of our property, our liberty, and our lives.

1855 ART. 4. Hath a brother a right to defend himself with a deadly weapon at the appearance of being in danger? Considered, he hath **not,** inasmuch as the Savior says to Peter: "Put up thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword." Matt. xxvi. 52.

1863 ARTICLE 1. How are we to deal with our brethren who have enlisted and gone to the army as soldiers or teamsters, or those who have been drafted and are gone to the army? We think it not expedient to consider (or discuss) these questions at this time. Still it is believed, and was expressed, the gospel gave sufficient instruction.

1863 ART. 17. What plan will the Yearly Meeting recommend or adopt, that all the brethren must bear an equal share in paying the fines government will impose upon those brethren who may be drafted into the military service? In this case it is recommended by this Yearly Meeting that each member should be willing to contribute according to the true avails of their property, according to Gal. vi. 2.

1864 ART. 35. As our national troubles, consequent upon the rebellion now existing in our country, have caused considerable difficulty in our church, and have tried our non-resistant principles, and have caused several questions concerning the paying of bounty-money, voting, etc., to come before this council-meeting, what counsel will this Annual Meeting give upon these subjects? Answer: We exhort the brethren to steadfastness in the faith, and believe that the times in which our lots are cast strongly demand of us a strict adherence to all our principles, and especially to our non-resistant principle, a principle dear to every subject of the Prince of Peace, and a prominent doctrine of our fraternity, and to endure whatever sufferings and to make whatever sacrifice the maintaining of the principle may require, and not to encourage in any way the practice of war. And we think it more in accordance with our principles, that instead of paying bounty-money, and especially in taking an active part in raising bounty-money, to await the demands of the government, whether general, state, or local, and pay the fines and taxes required of us, as the gospel permits, and, indeed, requires. Matt. xxii. 21; Rom. xiii. 7. And lest the position we have taken upon political matters in general, and war matters in particular, should seem to make us, as a body, appear to be indifferent to our government, or in opposition thereto, in its efforts to suppress the rebellion, we hereby declare that it has our sympathies and our prayers, and that it shall have our aid in any way which does not conflict with the principles of the gospel of Christ. But since, in our Christian profession, we regard these gospel principles as superior or paramount to all others, consistency requires that we so regard them in our practices.

1875 ART. 13. Will this district-meeting ask the Annual Meeting to adopt suitable measures to enable the church to co-operate actively with the peace association of America? Answer: Our church itself being a peace association, we need not, as a body, co-operate with others, but we may, as individuals, give our influence in favor of peace.

1882 ART. 12. Inasmuch as the principles of our brethren have always been non-resistant, therefore the Yellow Creek District asks the Yearly Meeting, through the district meeting, to strictly advise the brethren to carry out those principles. Answer: This Yearly Meeting very cheerfully advises, and even urges and demands, that we ever hold sacred the non-resistant principles of our dear fraternity.

1917 ART. 3 which reads as follows: "Inasmuch as our country has gone into warfare and has taken up the draft law in order to raise its armies, will not this Yearly Meeting advise our dear members, especially the young, their duty as non-resistant and non-combatant followers of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ Who has given us a pattern that we should follow after in our pilgrimage here below?

And is it deemed advisable to abide by the law so far as to register when the census is taken of the men that come under the draft age? Answer: We, your sub-committee, agree to grant the request in the fore part of this query. As to the latter part of the query, we think it necessary to register as demanded by the law. Passed."

1941 ART. 3. Whereas our beloved Fraternity, as well as other historic peace churches, is now facing a crisis, as the church has at intervals for hundreds of years of her history, with regard to her position on non-violence and non-resistance as taught by the Scriptures, as understood and applied by the fathers of our Fraternity, and interpreted and recorded by our various annual councils, as follows:

> 1781. "Exhort in union all brethren to hold themselves guiltless, and take no part in war or bloodshedding."
> 1785. "First, we do not understand at all that we can give ourselves up to do violence. * * * We can not see or find any liberty to use any carnal sword."
>
> 1917. Art. 3 which reads as follows: "Inasmuch as our country has gone into warfare and has taken up the draft law in order to raise its armies, will not this Yearly Meeting advise our dear members, especially the young, their duty as non-resistant and non-combatant followers of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Who has given us a pattern that we should follow after in our pilgrimage here below?
>
> And is it deemed advisable to abide by the law so far as to register when the census is taken of the men that come under the draft age? Answer: We, your subcommittee, agree to grant the request in the fore part of this query. As to the latter part of the query, we think it necessary to register as demanded by the law. Passed."

We therefore pray this Yearly Meeting of 1941 to reaffirm and thereby strengthen all the above minutes referred to as well as all others that bear directly upon the issue, and advise our brethren against combatant and non-combatant service inasmuch as other provisions are offered by our government; and may the united conclusion of the brethren assembled in the fear of the Lord exhort all members to faithfully adhere to the injunction to "Pray for kings and all that are in authority." I Tim. 2:2.

Answer: We agree to grant the request of this query and we appreciate the provision that our government has made for us. Passed by the meeting.

Oaths, Swearing of

1785 ART. 2. And as to the **swearing of oaths,** we believe the word of Christ, that in all things which we are to testify, we shall testify what is yea, or what is true with yea, and what is nay, or not true with nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

1821 ART. 4. How far a brother is at liberty in giving testimony, to speak the truth before the higher powers, inasmuch as different forms are presented to brethren? Considered, that a brother by no means should take the liberty to lift up his hand, but should obey simply the counsel of the gospel, saying yea, if it is yea, and nay, if it is nay; "for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil."

1822 ART. 18. Concerning the form of proposing oaths in order to save one's conscience for the gospel's sake, whether we could answer with yea such a form, "And this you do under the pains and penalties of perjury?" It was considered, if a brother were grieved herein, let him counsel whether there was no other form for us.

1866 ART. 12. Can the brethren in Missouri take the oath of loyalty, as set forth in the new constitution of that state, to get the privilege to preach the gospel? Answer: They can not take that oath, if it conflicts with the principles of the gospel, as the brethren receive those principles, but we think that a proper construction of the constitution will not require any compromise of our principles. And we recommend to our brethren in Missouri to ascertain from the proper officers the true import of the oath, to see whether it does conflict with our Christian principles.

1871 ART. 5. Is it according to the gospel for a brother to swear his life against a brother? Answer: Not according to the gospel.

1872 ART. 20. We desire the Annual Meeting to correct the minutes of last year, Art. 5, so as to read: "Is it right for a brother to swear his life against a man for any cause," instead of, "Swear his life against a brother." Answer: We adopt the correction.

Offenses

1828 ART. 13. Whether, if a member sees another member commit sin publicly against truth, the first is in duty bound to speak privately to the failing member, or (at once to) present the case to one of the leading brethren? Considered (whether to do the first), it is as a member may choose but to do the latter remains his duty, inasmuch as public sins can not be atoned for between member and member.

1840 ART. 10. Whether a public fault could be settled and forgiven between brother and brother? Considered, that a publicly committed fault can only be settled before the church, and not between brother and brother, according to the word of the Lord.

1842 ART. 1. Whether the sense of the words of our Savior (Matt. xviii.), "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican," is the same with the expression of Paul the apostle, when he says, "Have no company with him." I. Cor. v. This same query had been before the yearly meeting in Virginia in the year 1837, and a similar one before the Annual Meeting in Morrison's Cove in the year 1840, and even in the year 1794 (almost fifty years ago) the brethren expressed their sense on the subject, which was read, and the brethren now assembled generally agreed to the then expressed views, desiring with our departed brethren that our dearly beloved brethren would seek to hold fast to the written word of truth, for we fear with them that whosoever will depart from it is in great danger to be deceived in these much confused times. Now he that attends strictly to the word will see plainly that in Matt. xviii. quite another case is mentioned than in I. Cor. v. There the Savior speaks of sins and offenses which a brother or sister may commit against a fellow-member. Here the apostle treats of vices and crimes which may be committed against God and the truth. And as there is a difference in the sins, even so is also a difference in the discipline. Already, under the law, there were some sins unto death, where the sinner had to die without mercy under two or three witnesses. Heb. x. 28. But some sins were not unto death, and could be atoned for by offerings and sacrifices. Even so there is a difference in the discipline under the gospel, as we may plainly see from those passages before alluded to, viz., Matt. xviii. and I. Cor. v., if we examine them more closely. Therefore the brethren have always considered, and we yet consider, that the divine sense requires to disown a member who will not be told unto when it has been overtaken in a fault, which might have been atoned for by an acknowledgment, for his refusing to acknowledge, only so far as from the church-council, from the breaking of bread, and from the kiss. But a member that has fallen into gross sins and vices should be dealt with according to the word of God, as expressed by the Apostle Paul, viz., "Not to keep company with such a one, no, not to eat."

1850 ART. 8. If a brother, or sister, commit a gross crime, such as getting drunk, etc., can it be settled, by any visiting brethren, without bringing it before the church, or what course is to be pursued in such cases? Considered, that a brother, or sister, guilty of a crime, as set forth in the question, should be brought before the church, agreeable to Paul's first letter to

Timothy (chap. v. 20): "Them that sin, rebuke before all, that others, also, may fear."

1850 ART. 15. Whether it is according to the gospel for a church to lay a public acknowledgment on a brother that has made a public offense? Considered, that the acknowledgment is to be made before the church alone, and before all the members present. (See I. Tim. v. 20): "Them that sin rebuke before all, that others may fear."

1850 ART. 37. If it is proven, by two or three brethren, that a brother has been drinking to excess, yet not so much as to disable him from keeping on his feet, but has often before been charged, and also before been set back or put in avoidance, and still denies the charge, would he not come under the class of drunkards, or would it be prudent to hold him as a brother, or should he be expelled by the proof of four or five witnesses, though not members of the church? Considered, that no member should be put in avoidance without positive proof, from members, that he or she has been guilty of one of those sins mentioned by Paul (I. Cor. v. 11).

1855 ART. 24. If two brethren, or members, should raise a quarrel, before or in presence of others, so as nearly to come to bodily conflict, or to fight, can such matter be settled between those members, or ought it be brought before the church? Considered, that such public crimes must be settled before and by the church.

1857 ART. 4. Does that part of the eighteenth chapter of the gospel according to Matthew, which is read to applicants for baptism, cover all cases of trespasses and offenses, public and private? Answer: No; it does not contain all the divine law upon the subject of offenses, but it is the best rule to pursue with offending members.

1863 ART. 10. If one brother clandestinely slanders another, then gets a letter of recommendation and removes from the church before the slandered brother is aware of the offense against him, how is the offended brother to proceed? The offended brother should request the church where he lives to assist him in getting a reconciliation.

1873 ART. 26. Inasmuch as there are differences of opinion among the brethren as to the nature of offenses that should be settled between the parties immediately concerned, or that may be brought directly to the church, it is desired that this meeting define this subject more clearly, so as to bring about more unanimity of opinion and action. Answer: All offenses that are strictly against a brother or sister should be settled according to Matt. xviii, but such as are of a general nature, affecting the whole body, said body must be concerned in settling of its own accounts. In case a brother neglects or refuses to go according to Matt. xviii., then the church should send brethren to investigate, and report to the church as directed in Matt. xviii.

Offices, Holding Worldly

1789 ART. 3. Further it has been discussed, and unanimously deemed good and evangelical, that all brethren, in all places, should shun all worldly offices, so as not to serve in any of them, provided it is possible to be relieved from them—such as supervisor, overseer of the poor, collector, constable, assessor, or also juryman, etc. Yet it is considered, with some difference, such a supervisor or overseer of the poor might be served, perhaps, with least objection; provided, there is no suing, or something else contrary to the word of the Lord, His will, then only that what he would have to do contrary to the gospel should be rebuked in love and compassion, according to the word of the Lord.

1812 ART. 6. Concerning brethren who are sometimes prevailed upon to serve in the office of constable, it was considered that a follower of Jesus could not serve in such office; and if a brother should accept of it, take the oath of office, and serve in it, or by some person else as his substitute, such a brother would exclude himself from the breaking of bread, holy kiss, and brotherly council.

1822 ART. 2. Whether a brother might serve in a worldly office or as a juryman, was considered, that no follower of Jesus can serve in such, and if he could get relieved with money (by paying a fine), he should not serve herein.

1825 ART. 6. Concerning a brother holding the office of justice of the peace, has been twice before the big meeting, and was always considered that it was not at all consistent with the gospel; but as something more definite is requested, the counsel is now, if such an one has been admonished already before to give up that office, and is once and again admonished (in the name of the church) to do so, and will not give it up, such an one we could not hold as a brother.

1834 ART. 8. Concerning the office of supervisor and other worldly offices, was considered, that brethren should keep themselves clear of them as much as possible.

1839 ART. 1. Whether a brother could serve in the office of a constable? No. (See above, yearly meeting 1812.)

1842 ART. 10. How it is considered, when a man who holds the office of justice of the peace, is received by baptism as a member in the church, and is permitted to continue in his office until the time should expire for which he was elected; and how it is considered when a brother, or even a deacon, is elected to the same office of justice of the peace, and enters upon the duties of the same? Considered, that in case a man who holds such an office is convinced of the truth, and becomes willing to obey the gospel, it appears to us there would be no great difficulty to convince him also that he can not serve two masters, nor be at the same time a follower of the Lamb and a servant of the world; and as to a brother, or even a deacon, in the church to serve in such an office, it was considered quite inconsistent with the gospel we profess, and that it ought not to be.

1844 ART. 3. Whether a brother may go to the legislative assembly, as a representative of the people, agreeably with the gospel? Considered, that though we look upon the higher powers of this world as being of God, for the protection of the pious, etc., and desire to be thankful to God for the benefits we enjoy under our government, and feel it our duty to pray fervently and daily for the same, we can not see how a follower of the meek and lowly Savior can seek and accept an office of this kind consistently with the gospel he professeth. (See Matt. xx. 25-28; Mark x. 42-46; Luke xxii. 25; John xvii. 16, etc.)

1849 ART. 34. Whether a brother, being elected to the office of constable, contrary to his will, would be justifiable in taking the obligations of the office, and transfer it to another person, who will discharge the whole duties of said office? Considered, while the brother would have to be under oath, and responsible for all the acts of his substitute, it would not be safe for him to do so.

1850 ART. 9. Is it allowed for a brother to fulfill a worldly office, especially one that holds an office in the church; and if not, what is the proper course to proceed with such a brother? Considered, that we could not advise brethren to crave worldly offices; but if the people of the world should impose an office on any of our brethren, they should, before acting in such office, lay the matter before the church, and act agreeably to the counsel of the same.

Office Holding, Civil

1857 ART. 30. Is it consistent with the gospel for brethren to serve in the capacity of any of the civil officers under our government; and is there any material difference, as to state, county, or township officers? Answer: We consider it wrong for brethren to accept of any office, which requires them to administer an oath, or to use physical force, in performing the duties of that office.

1866 ART. 38. Can a man be received into the church, and hold his office as assessor? We think he can not consistently with the gospel. John xviii. 36; Matt. vi. 24.

1867 ART. 25. Can brethren be allowed to officiate in reconstructing the government, in holding elections, and participating in conventions? Answer: We consider it contrary to the gospel, as understood by the brethren, to act officially in any government matter whatever. Luke xvi. 13.

1872 ART. 22. We desire the Annual Meeting to reconsider Art. 3, of the minutes of 1844, and if the present answer may be adopted, then what shall be done with a brother who violates the decision? The query above alluded to, with the answer, are as follows: "Whether a brother may go to the legislative assembly, as a representative of the people, agreeably with the gospel? Considered, that though we look upon the higher powers of the world as being of God, for the protection of the pious, and desire to be thankful to God for the benefit we enjoy under our government, and feel it our duty to pray fervently and daily for the same, we can not see how a follower of the meek and lowly Savior can seek and accept an office of this kind consistently with the gospel he professeth. (See Matt. xx. 25-28; Mark x. 42-46; Luke xxii. 25; John xvii. 16, etc.") The query was reconsidered, and the following answer given by this meeting: Answer: We readopt the answer to the minutes alluded to, and consider that any brother who suffers himself to be elected to such office as that named, and to serve in it, can not be retained as a member of the church.

1874 ART. 4. A brother, holding the office of a deacon in the church, and is nominated for the office of county commissioner, and accepts of the nomination, the church then takes his office from him. Does the coming district and Annual Meetings decide and determine that the gospel also demands and requires that the church deprive the brother from the privilege of communing, or, in other words, of partaking of the emblems of the broken body of the Lord? If so, let the gospel authority be produced. Answer: The church is justified, according to the gospel, and the order of the brethren, in prohibiting such a brother from the communion; and any brother who will contend publicly or privately, that it is not wrong for a Christian to hold the office of county commissioner should be admonished in love to do so no more, and if he does, the church should deal with him according to Matt. xviii. (See Romans xvi. 7, 18; II. Thess. iii. 14, 15; Matt. vi. 24; Brethren's Encyclopedia, page 23; Minutes of 1778 and 1779; and first page, Minutes of 1797; also Minutes of 1822, Art. 6; also Minutes of 1861, Art. 3.)

1874 ART. 9. Is it right for a brother to hold the office of postmaster? Answer: We know of no reason why he should not.

1876 ART. 3. Is it agreeable to the gospel and faith, and order of the brethren, to hold the office of school director under the present laws of Pennsylvania? Answer: We think it best for brethren not to serve in such capacity, where a school director, according to the laws of the state, may have to collect school-tax, and imprison a person if he does not pay his tax.

1880 ART. 10. How is it considered by the brethren, if a brother be elected in the capacity of a land appraiser? Would it conflict with the gospel or our profession? Answer: We would advise that brethren had better not accept such an office.

Official Council

1872 ART. 7. Is it according to the order of the brethren in private council that there be a unanimous consent of the "official brethren" concerning any matter before it can come before the church? Answer: The official brethren should not bring a matter before the church, if they are divided, until they have called the assistance of bishops of adjoining districts.

1877 ART. 26. It is requested that Article 7, of the minutes of 1872, be reconsidered. Answer: We decide to reconsider and adopt the following: It is not necessary that the officers be unanimous, but a majority of the officers is sufficient. **(Recon. Min.)**

1884 SEC. 32. ON BRINGING A MATTER BEFORE THE CHURCH relative to the officials being united. We adopt Article 26, 1877. (Accepted.)

1901 ART. 3. Will this Yearly Meeting reconsider Section 32 of reconsidered minutes of 1883 and 1884? Is not Article 7, 1877 in harmony with the Gospel? See Matt. 12. 25; 1 Cor. I.

10; Phil. 1. 27 and 2. 2; 1 Pet. 3. 8. Answer: Yes, we agree to reconsider Section 32 of reconsidered minutes of 1883 and 1884, and that Article 7, 1877, which reads as follows: "The official brethren should not bring a matter before the church, if they are divided, until they have called the assistance of bishops of adjoining districts," is in harmony with the Gospel, and shall be put on the minutes.

Officials, Seating of

1911 ART. 2. An official brother moves out of one arm of church into another organized arm of church where there is another brother in the same degree of office who is younger in office: which of the two shall sit above the other, the one who is a resident or the one who has just moved in? Answer: We, your sub-committee, would decide that the elder or elders having such cases in charge, take with them two or more adjoining elders and let them, with the church agree which one shall sit at the head, and fully explain the matter to the church. Passed.

1927 ART. 6. Inasmuch as there exists a difference of practice in the Brotherhood as to the seating of officials that move into different districts, some seating the official as to his length of time in office, others seating the official at the foot of the bench, regardless of the time he has been in office: That is, a brother who has been in the deacon's office 40 years may be seated below a brother who has been only elected a short time, the older brother having just moved into the district; and likewise with brethren in the ministry, in their degree. Provided, however, that nothing stated herein should be applied to elders who are housekeepers in the district in which they reside, and rule well. See 1st Timothy 5:17. Does the scripture, 1st Peter 5:5 mean the younger in office or the district? Likewise ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder?

Answer: The position of the ministry should be left to the decision of the local church, but as to deacons, the younger should be subject to the elder in office. Passed.

1939 ART. 2. (1) We pray this A. M. to reconsider Article 6, of the A. M. of 1927, and grant that elders and ministers moving from one church district to another, be treated with the same degree of respect as deacon brethren, and that they be seated according to age in office, in their respective offices. First Peter 5:5 applies to elders and ministers as well as to deacons.

The position of presiding elders need not be changed merely by other elders moving into the district.

(2) We ask the A. M. of 1939 to reconsider Article 6, of 1927 along with its answer; which query asks for a uniform practice over the Brotherhood, as to seating of an official brother, whether a deacon, a first degree or second degree minister or an elder who moves into another district.

The answer of said query does not seem consistent with the "provision" or "reserve" made in the query, namely, "Provided, however, that nothing stated herein shall be applied to elders who are house-keepers in the district in which they reside and rule well."

Further, the answer can be interpreted as to change old order church ruling which endeavors to protect the official seated position of resident elders, and especially of the elder in charge. All elders to be considered house-keepers, but only one as elder in charge or presiding elder.

Hence, to make a definite and plain practice of seating officials that move into different districts, the following is suggested:

1st. As to deacons: The younger deacon should be subject to the elder deacon in office.

2nd. As to the first and second degree ministers: Their position should be left to the decision of the local church or congregation.

3rd. As to elders: Their position should be below the resident elders.

Answer: We decide that the seating of all incoming officials shall be at the foot of the office in which they hold. Passed.

1943 ART. 2. To the Annual Meeting of 1943: Inasmuch as Art. 2 of the minutes of 1939 does not fully harmonize with the Scriptures (See 1 Peter 5:5; Rom. 12:10); nor does it give satisfaction in all cases, because it gives no liberty for the local church to respect or give preference to age of incoming officials:

Therefore we ask this A. M. to grant as an amendment to said minute, that when dissatisfaction arises, to let the matter be decided by the private voice of the local church.

Answer: The request of this query granted by the meeting.

Officials, Reinstating

1904 ART. 3. Inasmuch as there seems to be nothing on the minutes of our Yearly Meeting relative to electing officials in such churches where there are such officials who have been silenced or relieved of their office in time past: Will not this Yearly Meeting give us an order as how to proceed in such cases, and place on the minutes said order so that we all may labor in union in such important duties as electing and reinstating of officials in our beloved fraternity? Answer: Inasmuch as officials once elected are relieved by the united counsel of the church (if unfaithful), they are again restored to office by the same means without re-election, if found needful and worthy by the church to be restored; if not worthy, others may be elected.

1908 ART. 4. Is it right according to the Gospel and the ancient order of our old fathers, when an official brother has been relieved of his office, and in course of time he gives evidence of repentance to the satisfaction of the church and she sees fit to reinstate him, to receive him with hand and kiss as in the installation? Answer: We fail to find any direct Gospel bearing on this point; but according to the common practice of the church, we do not think it necessary to receive him with hand and kiss as at first.

1938 ART. 7. We pray this A. M. for a decision as to what is to be done in the case of a deposed official moving into another district for a period of five or seven years with a letter of membership and in full fellowship, an effort being made in the district where he holds his membership for reinstatement, but fails because of objections from the district in which he formerly lived? Yet have broken the bread of communion with him. Now, we pray in the spirit of love, how long can such district withhold deposed members without taking any means for a reconciliation?

Answer: Considered that time is not the factor entering into the question, but the gravity of the offense and the attitude of the deposed one, should determine it, which are known to the district in which he was deposed, and it should be left to the decision of that district. See Luke 3:8. Passed.

Ordination of Officials

1843 ART. 6. Whether the ordination of a brother can be frustrated, when the whole church is united on the subject, with the exception of one or a few members? Considered, that in case the ordination of a brother is judged as necessary and proper by the church and the ordained brethren from a distance, and there could be no weighty objection made by those that are of another opinion in this matter, they ought to acquiesce in it, and the ordination might go on according to the desire of the church.

(Recon. Min.)

1883 SEC. 14. FORMS, ORDINATIONS, ANOINTING THE SICK. We endorse them as they stand upon the book. Deacons, 1835, Art. 15. Ministers, 1874, Art. 9. Elders, 1877, Art. 31. Anointing, 1860, Art. 6. (Accepted.)

Orphans, Orphan's Homes

1870 ART. 8. Is it the duty of the members of the church to take special care of their orphan children in getting homes for them among the brethren, and in having them raised up in the faith of the gospel? Answer: We think it is according to Eph. vi. 4.

1873 ART. 17. Since the district-meeting of middle Indiana, last year, had under consideration the orphan's home, or a home for orphan children, and expressed itself favorable, but laid it over for further consideration, will not this meeting take into consideration the propriety of erecting a home for orphan children, and members who are a church charge? Answer: This Annual Meeting does not see the propriety of adopting such at present, but if the middle district of Indiana desires to do so, we will not oppose it.

(Recon. Min.)

1884 SEC. 30. CARING FOR THE POOR ORPHAN CHILDREN. See Article 3, 1812, and Article 8, 1870. (Accepted.)

Patent Rights

1841 ART. 7. Whether members may be permitted to obtain and sell patent rights for their own inventions? Considered, that it is not advisable for members to take out and sell patent-rights.

1855 ART. 7. How it would be considered, if a brother obtains a patent for any invention? Considered, that it would be safest, in all cases, first to ask council of the church before obtaining a patent.

1866 ART. 24. Is it allowed for brethren to travel through the country selling patent rights, and buying stock for speculators, being looked at as sharp traders? Answer: This meeting does not approve of brethren doing so, and if it is done, we recommend the churches having the care of such who do it, to attend to it.

1890 ART. 2. Do the brethren, in Annual Meeting assembled consider it right for brethren to buy the right of territory to sell and deal in a patent article, or machine, and to go around over the country soliciting orders for the same? Answer: Not advisable for brethren to do so. (See 1841, Art. 7; 1855, Art. 7; 1866, Art. 24.)

Peace

1874 ART. 2. Inasmuch as the public mind is awakened on the subject of peace, both among nations and societies, should not the church at large take notice of "the signs of the times," and teach more earnestly at this time this cardinal doctrine of Christ and the church? Answer: We think the church should do so.

Pensions for Soldiers

1836 ART. 1. Whether a brother would have a right to take such money, which he had acquired as a soldier by war? Considered in union, that it can not be, according to the doctrine of Jesus.

1866 ART. 42. How is it considered by the brethren in Annual Council, for sisters, who are in needy circumstances, to avail themselves of the benefit of an act, passed by the legislature of Pennsylvania, granting a gratuity and pension to the soldiers of the war of 1812, or to their widows? Considered right for them to receive it.

1870 ART. 2. Is it considered right for a brother to take or receive a pension, back pay, or bounty, for services rendered to the government before he became a member of the church? Answer: We think he may be allowed to do so.

1878 ART. 7. A son of a sister, whose husband is living, perished in the army; is it right, under any circumstances, for the sister to draw pension from the government? Answer: It is.

1894 ART. 1. Inasmuch as the taking of soldiers' pensions of late has been considerably agitated, and looked upon by many of our members as being of doubtful propriety, will not this Yearly Meeting reconsider all the minutes favoring the taking of pensions and advise all our members to have respect for the answer as given on that question in the year 1836, Article 1? Answer: This Yearly Meeting agrees to reconsider all the minutes (favoring pensions) on record conflicting with the advice of 1836, Article 1, which seems to be in harmony with the doctrine of Jesus, and let the church rid herself of this question by saying. We can not advise our members to take pension.

Physician—Not to Advertise as Member of the Church

1866 ART. 31. Does this meeting approve of a brother who is a physician to forward his reputation by stating in his bills and circulars that he is a member of the German Baptist Church? Answer: We do not approve of it.

Plain Language

1850 ART 18. Would it not be more in accordance with Holy Writ, and the consistent manner of a plain people, to use the plain language, especially calling the days and months by their number? Considered, nearer the gospel to use plain language.

Politics

1841 ART. 10. Whether a follower of Jesus may attend political meetings? Considered, that it is not becoming at all for brethren who have renounced the world.

1852 ART. 3. Have we a right to help make the political government, and to serve as officers, also, to put the law in force against any of our fellow-men, in any case whatever? Considered, that the brethren should be careful and not betray their profession in helping to make and serve the civil government, and, if they give in their vote, they should do it in a quiet and peaceable manner, without taking part in electioneering, and return immediately from the ground; that brethren should hold no office under the civil government that would cause them to betray their faith; and as respects using the law against our fellow creatures, brethren should use lenity and Christian forbearance toward our fellow-men, and not compel them by the law, unless prompted to do so by stern necessity. But before so doing they should always take the counsel of the church.

1854 ART. 23. A request to reconsider query 3 on the Minutes of 1852. Considered, that this query was sufficiently and correctly answered in 1852. (See Rom. vi. 16, x. 1-3; II. Pet. i. 19, ii. 19; I. John iii. 8, 9; Matt. vi. 24; II. Cor. vi. 5-8; John xviii. 36.)

1864 ART. 35. As our national troubles, consequent upon the rebellion now existing in our country, have caused considerable difficulty in our church, and have tried our non-resistant principles, and have caused several questions concerning the paying of bounty-money, voting, etc., to come before the council-meeting, what council will this Annual Meeting give upon these subjects? Answer: We exhort the brethren to steadfastness in the faith, and believe that the times in which our lots are cast strongly demand of us a strict adherence to all our principles, and especially to our non-resistant principle, a principle dear to every subject of the Prince of Peace, and a prominent doctrine of our fraternity to endure whatever sufferings and to make whatever sacrifice the maintaining of the principle may require, and not to encourage in any way the practice of war. And we think it more in accordance with our principles, that instead of paying bounty-money, and especially in taking an active part in raising bounty-money, to await the demands of the government, whether general, state, or local, and pay the fines and taxes required of us, as the gospel permits, and, indeed, requires. Matt xxii. 21; Rom. xiii. 7. And lest the position we have taken upon political matters in general, and war matters in particular, should seem to make us, as a body, appear to be indifferent to our government, or in opposition thereto, in its efforts to suppress the rebellion, we hereby declare that it has our sympathies and our prayers, and that it shall have our aid in any way which does not conflict with the principles of the gospel of Christ. But since, in our Christian profession, we regard these gospel principles as superior or paramount to all others, consistency requires that we so regard them in our practices.

1877 ART. 11 As political elections have caused trouble and hard feelings in many congregations, the Northern District of Indiana respectfully asks the Annual Meeting to make voting at political elections a **test of fellowship.** Answer: We re-adopt the minutes of Annual Meeting, 1866, Article 1.

Prayer

1805 ART. 3. Concerning praying (the Lord's Prayer) "Our Father," since some do not make the same expressions as given by the Evangelists from the mouth of Jesus, it was considered, that we should use the expressions according to the pattern of the doctrine of Jesus, our Master, and at the same time contemplate the meaning contained in these words, so that we may pray with the spirit and understanding of the heart, according to the mind of Christ, and in truth.

1862 ART. 35. Is the practice of one ministering brother doing all the vocal praying in the assemblies of Christians, and ending his prayer with the Lord's prayer, more like the apostolic advice and practice than that of our brethren formerly, when two exercised in vocal prayer? Answer: We consider it is not, when there are several brethren present.

Prayer Meetings

1851 ART. 15. How is it considered, for brethren to appoint meetings for prayer exclusively? Considered, that the brethren can not recommend such meetings, as a general thing, except in cases of peril; but on the other hand, they consider it a duty and privilege to pray in our families, and in the closet, and other secret places, as well as to join the public prayer in our regular meetings for worship.

1851 ART. 16. How is it considered for brethren, that hold prayer-meetings, and invite others, that are of a different belief, to take part in prayer, and call them brethren? Considered utterly wrong for brethren to do so.

1853 ART. 25. How is it considered, when brethren hold prayer meetings decently and in order? Considered, that every brother should meet daily with his family, for worship in his own house; that when brethren meet together, accidently or by appointment, they are at perfect liberty to sing and pray together, read the Scriptures, and exhort each other, all of which should be done decently and in order; but we would advise our brethren to drop the name of prayer-meeting, and call them simply meetings.

1859 ART. 9. Is it considered to be right to call prayer-meetings social meetings? Answer: It is considered right to do so.

1859 ART. 20. Is it agreeable with the gospel for members to hold prayer-meetings, or, what they are some times called, social meetings, and to invite members of other denominations to unite with us in prayer? Answer: We consider it agreeable with the gospel to hold such meetings, when they are strictly held in order; but as we do not call upon our own members, individually, to pray, it is not in our order of holding such meetings, to call on those of other denominations to pray.

1859 ART. 22. Is it according to the gospel, and the rules of the brethren, for a brother in the second degree of the ministry to appoint a prayer-meeting, without the consent of the bishop and other brethren in the church? Answer: We think it is not. The Apostle Paul declares that God is a God of order, and such a course does not seem to be in order. And the Apostle Peter's language (I. Peter v. 5, 6) would likewise seem to disapprove of such a course.

1862 ART. 2. With regard to prayer-meetings, how should they be conducted? Answer: All our meetings for divine service should be conducted according to the gospel, which requires all things to be done decently and in order.

(Recon. Min.)

1884 SEC. 21. PRAYER-MEETINGS. We adopt the advice given 1851, Article 15, 16, (Accepted.)

1843 ART. 4. Whether members may take the liberty to go to prayer-meetings, etc., of other persuasions, to take part in them, and to permit and invite ministers of other persuasions to hold meetings in their (the members) own houses? Considered, that as we have come into very perilous times, according to the word of our Savior (Matt. xxiv, 22-26), and of his apostles (I. Tim. iv., and II. Peter ii., etc.,) and we therefore have the greatest reason to be seriously on our guard; that prayer is an important part of worship, which must be performed in spirit and in truth in order to be pleasing in the sight of God; that consequently true inward union in prayer with such that are not in one spirit and in the same truth with us can not be thought of; that under these considerations it would be the safest course not to go to such places, nor to take part in such exercises, much less to invite or to receive teachers of whom we may know before hand that they will not bring the whole apostolic doctrine in order to hold meetings in our houses. II. John x.

Preaching

1885 ART. 3. Would it not be well for us to be more cautious in being personal in our preaching, in our private conversation, and more especially in writing for the **Vindicator,** since it agitates? [See Eph. iv. 29.] Answer: We advise it would be well to do so. [See I. Tim. i. 18-20; Gal. v. 15-26.]

1853 ART. 30. How is it considered when brethren preach a doctrine, which is not in acordance with the decision of the Yearly Meeting, and speak privately to or with members against such decision? Considered, that for love and union sake they ought not to do so.

1863 ART. 26. If brethren, not elected, being endowed with the gift of prophecy, and moved by the Holy Ghost to occupy, with their talents, as their Lord commands, and being called on by the people to preach, have the bishops of the church any authority from the gospel to forbid it, merely because they are not elected, provided he or they preach Jesus to edification, exhortation, and comfort, and their appointments do not conflict with any regular meetings of the church? As the apostle directs the spirit of the prophets to be subject to the prophets (I. Cor. xiv. 35), and as God is said to be the author of peace, and not of confusion (verse 33), and as the apostle asks the question, "How should they preach except they be sent?" Romans x. 15.) and as Christ selected, from the number of his disciples, those that he had designed to preach the gospel, it appears by the gospel not only proper but necessary that there should be a regular induction of those who are to officiate as ministers into the office of the ministry, and therefore we can not sanction the idea entertained by some, that any brother may go out and appoint meetings for preaching.

1865 ART. 28. Has any brother a right to preach that is not elected by the voice of the church? Answer: We think not, according to the apostolic practice and teaching. (See Acts i. 26; vi. 3; II. Tim. ii. 2.)

1865 ART. 29. Has any brother a right to call on a brother to preach in public, who is not yet elected to preach? Answer: We think not, for it is contrary to the gospel, and it causes offense and confusion in the church.

1871 ART. 7. Should not this district adopt measures to provide and supply ministerial aid for churches where there is no preacher? and also to fill calls, open missions, preach the gospel, and introduce the principles of the brethren in the many sections within said district, which they have not yet reached? Answer: This Annual Meeting approves of the suggestions in the above query, as it is very necessary that churches or bodies of brethren, in which there are no resident ministers, should be assisted, and inasmuch as there are many localities where the gospel, as preached and practiced by the brethren, is not known, we think the gospel should be taken into such places. As it regards the measures necessary to accomplish these objects, we think the district should adopt such measures as it judges best calculated to answer its purpose.

[NOTE.—This query came to the Annual Meeting without any answer. It was the duty of the standing committee to form an answer to it, and submit said answer to the General Council. The above answer was accordingly formed and submitted to the committee, and received the unanimous vote of the committee. But owing to the fact that it was not answered, it was deferred, when first introduced, and was afterward overlooked. It then occurred to the mind of the clerk that it had been overlooked, and he regretted it very much. Having an opportunity to do so he mentioned the circumstances to several of the standing committee after the meeting closed, and they thought it might be put on the minutes. We accordingly insert it, not as having received the sanction of the General Council, but that of the standing committee.—Clerk.]

1872 ART. 19. Resolved, that the request of John Dennis and his brethren, of the State of Maine, in regard to a ministering brother being sent to them, to preach the gospel and make known to them the order of the brethren, should not be slighted, but prayfully considered by the Annual Meeting, and measures adopted to carry the same into effect. Answer: We think the minutes of 1860 and 1868 give the church ample liberty to make arrangements to meet the case above alluded to; we therefore refer the subject to the district-meeting from which it came.

1875 ART. 24. As Christ never published Himself, would it not be better for the brethren traveling and preaching not to publish themselves, in stating how many sermons they preached, and how many persons they baptized; as much as to say: "See what I have done?" Answer: Not advisable to do so.

Publications

1850 ART. 21. Whether there is any danger to be apprehended from publishing a paper among us? This subject to lay over till next Annual Meeting.

1851 ART. 8. What is the opinion of the Yearly Meeting, with regard to having a paper published, under the title, "The Monthly Gospel Visitor?" Considered, at this council, that we will not forbid Bro. Henry Kurtz to go on with the paper for one year; and that all the brethren or churches will impartially examine the "Gospel Visitor," and if found wrong, or injurious, let them send in their objections at the next Annual Meeting.

1852 ART. 4. In regard to the continuation of the "Gospel Visitor," it was concluded, that inasmuch as there is a diversity of opinion upon the subject—some in favor, and others opposed—we cannot forbid its publication at this time, and hope those brethren opposed to it will exercise forbearance, and let it stand or fall, on its own merits.

1853 ART. 3. In regard to the fourth query of last year's minutes, concerning the "Gospel Visitor?" Inasmuch as the "Visitor" is a private undertaking of its editor, we unanimously conclude that this meeting should not any further interfere with it.

1854 ART. 14. Is it consistent with the example and doctrine of Christ and his apostles, when brethren write and publish books, and afterward revise and republish them, etc.? Considered, that brethren should be careful in their publications, and especially of other men's books.

1857 ART. 3. Is it prudent to publish fictitious names to articles published in public prints? Answer: It is not prudent for brethren to do so.

1865 ART. 8. How is it viewed for a brother or for brethren to write against the ancient order and customs of the church, and have their manuscripts or writings printed, and thus distributed in and out of the church? Answer: We think it is not right to do so.

1865 ART. 51. As many brethren seem to so far disregard the advice of the Annual Council as to send to the "Gospel Visitor" and "Christian Companion" articles exposing, through their editors, the counsel of the old brethren, will this meeting adopt means to put a stop to these things? Answer: We consider it wrong to do so, and think we should not disregard the counsel and decisions of the Annual Meeting; and such articles as oppose the order of the brethren should not be published, and if the brethren still persist in doing so, they should be dealt with as offenders.

1869 ART. 4. What does this district think of the propriety of requiring brethren, who shall hereafter write and publish books, to submit them to a committee, appointed by the Yearly Meeting, for examination and approval, before they offer them to the public? Answer: We think it advisable for brethren to do so.

1870 ART. 6. Whereas, there was a letter published in one of our periodicals soon after the last Annual Meeting in which statements were made unfavorable to the integrity of the standing committee, and thereby involving, more or less, the character of the whole meeting, we therefore think that the correctness of the statements above referred to should be investigated, and consequently ask the next Annual Meeting to make such an investigation. The subject being considered, the Annual Meeting thought that an investigation was necessary, and appointed the following brethren a committee to investigate the subject: Solomon Garber, Jacob Wine, Peter Nininger, Moses Miller, and J. D. Trostle.

1873 ART. 7. Whereas, the "Christian Family Companion" and "Pilgrim" have published articles with reference to decisions of questions of Annual Meeting, differing from the sentiment contained in said decisions; and, also, communications from others, even from those who are not members of the church, and even from expelled members, reflecting seriously upon the character of the Annual Meeting; therefore, resolved, that the editors of said periodicals be required to make acknowledgment of their offense, and to promise to be more guarded in the future in this respect. The acknowledgment was made, and the promise given.

1874 ART. 14. Inasmuch as many brethren and sisters are aggrieved at the statements made by Bro. D. P. Sayler, in the "Gospel Visitor," Vol. 22, No. 10, page 293, first column, commencing eighteen lines from the top, should he not make a public acknowledgment? Answer: As Bro. Sayler's views of the passage of Scripture, in relation to which the objectionable sentiments were advanced, was given as his individual sentiment, and not the sentiment of the brotherhood; and as the church has not expressed its view of the passage, we think it premature to ask him to make public satisfaction.

1875 ART. 29. Inasmuch as there exists a strong demand for tracts advocating the faith and practice of the brethren, we earnestly recommend a more united effort to carry forward this work, and facilitate the publication and circulation of works of this character, subject, before publication, to the examination and approval of competent and well-established brethren; therefore, we earnestly recommend that the brethren give this matter an earnest and prayerful consideration. Approved by order of the district-meeting, and confirmed by this Annual Meeting.

1875 ART. 31. The southern district of Missouri petitions and entreats the Annual Meeting to restrict our editors in publication of matter derogatory to or militating against the advice, counsel, and decision, as given by our beloved brethren, at our Annual Meetings, from time to time, such as advocating high schools, salaried preachers, musical instruments, etc. Answer: We caution our editors, and all our brethren, from writing or publishing any thing against the acknowledged doctrines of the church.

1875 ART. 35. The committee appointed by the Annual Meeting of 1874, to collect the minutes of former Annual Meetings, held since the Brethren's Encyclopedia was published, finding a wish among the brethren to have the minutes omitted in the Encyclopedia published, as well as those passed by Annual Meeting since that work was published, have delayed our work until the Annual Meeting gives us further instruction. Shall we, then, publish all the minutes of Annual Meetings that can be collected, or only those passed by the Annual Meetings since the publication of the Brethren's Encyclopedia? Answer: Let all be published, and the work be called, "Minutes of Annual Councils."

1879 ART. 16. Whereas, petitions were presented from Northwestern Ohio, Eastern Pennsylvania, Middle Pennsylvania, and Virginia, as well as from Southern Ohio, requesting this Annual Meeting to prohibit the slanderous and schismatic articles from being published in the **Progressive Christian** and **Deacon;** therefore it is required **First,** That the editors of the **Progressive Christian** make an humble acknowledgment to the Annual Meeting for publishing erroneous statements in regard to church members, charging a part of the church with idolatry, stigmatizing some of its members with terms of reproach, ridiculing some of the peculiar practices of the church, and admitting into the paper inflammatory and **schismatic articles,** some even from expelled members. **Second.** That the editor of the **Vindicator** and of the **Deacon** are also required to make satisfactory acknowledgments for writing or publishing similar articles as the **Progressive Christian. Third.** That Elder John Harshey, Brethren James Ridenour, and Howard Miller be required to render satisfaction to the Annual Meeting for writing schismatic articles. **Fourth.** That the editors of all our periodicals be required hereafter not to admit into their papers any articles that will assail the doctrine of the church in regard to nonconformity to the world, the personal character of ministers, or any of its peculiar tenets or practices.

1881 ART. 4. The following papers came from different parts of the brotherhood, and were, by action of the council, submitted to a committee of brethren to report upon them: "Inasmuch as Brother H. R. Holsinger has been admonished by the Annual Meeting again and again, according to the minutes of Annual Meeting, to cease to publish articles conflicting with the general order of the **old** brethren and good feeling of the church, and still continues to do the same, we now request Annual Meeting to deal with him according to Matthew xviii, and the decision of Annual Meeting, either directly or by a committee, and if he does not hear the church, hold him as a heathen man and a publican. Is it right for brethren to publish papers like the **Progressive Christian** and **Vindicator,** creating and fostering strife by publishing articles against the established order of the church, and if not right, what is to be done with brethren who publish such a paper or papers?" Answer: Not right for brethren to publish such a paper or papers, and any brother or brethren that publish **such a paper or** papers shall make an humble acknowledgment for so doing, and promise not to publish such articles any more in the future, said acknowledgment and agreement to be published in their paper or papers.

Is district meeting favorable towards calling the attention of Annual Meeting to the character of the paper called **Progressive Christian,** and require Brother Holsinger, its present editor, to cease publishing articles of criticism on Annual Meeting, its decisions, and its work among the churches through its organized committee, and cease publishing his own articles, or those of others advocating measures calculated to subvert the principles and rules of order in our brotherhood in matters of plainness of dress, and against the exercise of the expelling power of refractory members, and if he refuse so to promise, should not Annual Meeting declare such publication contrary to the best interest of the church of Christ, and provide accordingly? Answer: This district meeting requests Annual Meeting to decide that the **Progressive Christian** and all like papers, purporting to be published by a member or members of the Brethren Church, do not reflect the spirit and principles of the church of Christ. The policy pursued by such papers is in direct opposition to the principles enunciated in Titus iii. 1; I. Peter v. 5; James iv. 11, and I. Peter xi. 11. Editors and contributors who violate these principles of the gospel, subject themselves to arraignment and trial before the congregation where they reside, or before Annual Meeting. We further request Annual Meeting to require our editors to conduct their respective papers according to Romans xiv. 19, and Ephesians iv. 29, so that the body be edified, strengthened, and unified in love and holiness. We also look with sorrow upon the tendency to levity and jesting through the papers, and beseech writers and teachers to avoid the degrading habit, and remember I. Thessalonians v.

6-8; Ephesians v. 4, and iv. 29; Titus ii. 2-12; I. Peter i: 13; iv. 7; v. 8. And we further desire that Annual Meeting require Brother **H. R. Holsinger to make** confession for having violated the word of God in the manner in which he has conducted his paper.

WHEREAS, H. R. Holsinger is publishing articles in his paper which have a tendency to bring about discord among the brethren, and has a bad influence outside of the brotherhood, we request, therefore, that a committee be appointed whose duty it shall be to take notice of that paper, and if articles will continue to appear contrary to the faith and practice of the church, that it shall be their duty to bring said Brother Holsinger to an account, as in their judgment they may deem proper and right. Answer: This meeting asks the Annual Meeting to grant and appoint the committee herein asked for, that it may carry out the decisions of 1879, Article 16.

WHEREAS, H. R. Holsinger, editor of the **Progressive Christian,** is publishing and circulating through his paper, and by tracts, unchristian, and often untruthful reflections upon brethren, made either by such who were subjected to their local church discipline, or by such who withstand and resist parts of our general and recognized church order; and also publicly through his paper charges brethren with being untruthful, in violation of the gospel rule. (Matt. xviii. 16.) And, whereas, the tendency of such publications is to encourage disorder and misrule among the churches, affecting the peace and prosperity of local churches, and likewise the harmony of our General Conference; and, whereas, the church of the Southern Missouri District unite their efforts with all the churches of our general brotherhood towards preserving the principles and the precepts of the gospel as embodied in our long-established and general recognized rules and order of church fellowship. Will, therefore, district meeting consider it advisable to declare whether H. R Holsinger, or others, can be held and recognized by us as a brother, conducting a paper of the character of the **Progressive Christian,** now edited by H. R. Holsinger, and to declare whether in its judgment he can of right and with propriety be accepted to assist in general church work, or to serve on the Standing Committee. Answer: We view with fear the course pursued by H. R. Holsinger, in the manner of conducting his paper, and of the principle he advocates, and we are unanimous in the conviction that it should be declared that we can not regard him as a brother, and that he should be excluded from all participation in general church work, and we place these, our convictions, in the hands of the Standing Committee, to act in the premises as to them appears to be necessary.

The committee to which the above papers were submitted, made the following reports, which were passed by the meeting: We, the undersigned, members of the committee appointed to consider charges against H. R. Holsinger and Samuel Kinsey, find that H. R. Holsinger is publishing a paper in which many articles have appeared criticizing the work of Annual Meeting, and against the order of our church government, as also against our order of observing the gospel principle of non-conformity to the world in wearing apparel, after having been again and again admonished by our Annual Meeting to be more guarded in his publication, and promised to do so, which promise he has not performed, but has continued his former course with increased effort. We therefore recommend that this meeting appoint a committee to wait on him in his church, and deal with him according to his transgressions. S. S. Mohler, Daniel Vaniman, D. E. Price, George W. Cripe, Abraham Miller, Joel Neff, C. Bucher, John Brillhart, John Smith.

In reference to the complaint alleged against Brother Samuel Kinsey, editor of the **Vindicator,** we find he has not used due caution against admitting articles into his paper having a schismatic tendency, and criticising the work of committees, etc., (see volumes XI. and XII.), and we recommend a committee to be appointed to wait on him in his church and deal with him as his case demands. S. S. Mohler, C. Bucher, G. W. Cripe, John Smith, Daniel Vaniman, John Brillhart, D. E. Price, Abraham Miller, Joel Neff.

1881 ART. 5. The following papers, having reference to our periodicals, were also submitted to a committee to report on them to the council:

Inasmuch as the Brethren have always and wisely opposed paid or salaried ministry, because of its corrupting effects upon the church, and inasmuch as the periodicals conducted by our brethren under the present system are exposed to the same corrupting influence; and also because of the present growing difficulties in the brotherhood, which must largely be attributed to the present number and system of conducting our papers, we therefore recommend to the serious consideration of this district meeting the propriety of preparing and recommending to Annual Meeting one system for the conducting of a single paper, to be under the supervision of the brotherhood. With this view to concentrate the responsibility into a board of managers, whose duty it shall be to see that they are conducted in harmony with the spirit and tenor of the gospel.

On motion, the delegates selected a committee on publications, and on the morning of the 18th the committee reported as follows, which report, after some debate, was accepted and forwarded to Annual Meeting:

We, the undersigned brethren, having been appointed by the present district meeting to take into consideration the accompanying recommendation, have, after due and prayerful thought, come to the following conclusions, which we herewith present to the district meeting now in session, for its acceptance or rejection:

WHEREAS, The present manner of conducting the many papers now in the brotherhood, is having an injurious effect upon the church, therefore we ask Annual Meeting to appoint a committee to see what can be done toward consolidating the papers, and report to next Annual Meeting a plan by which such consolidation may be effected. And we further recommend that a committee be appointed to call to account—if not done by the church in which they live—all editors who shall allow objectionable articles that may cause dissensions or strife, and especially of a personal character, by referring to reports of committees or in any way causing hard feeling. Enoch Eby, John J. Emmert. Daniel Deardorff, J. C. Lehman, Edmond Forney, David E. Price, George D. Zollars, D. L. Miller. We ask district meeting to enact something that will reduce the superfluous number of periodicals now published in the brotherhood, and thus suppress and avoid the useless and injurious controversies that occur by reason of said superfluity.

The committee to which the above papers were submitted, made the following report, which was passed by the council:

We, your undersigned committee, have prayerfully considered the petition you presented us, and in our humble judgment decide,

1. That the present unhappy state of things among us is not occasioned by the number of papers published among us, but by the character of the matter contained in them. We decide,

2. That the publication of a periodical is a private enterprise, and, if properly conducted, is an important auxiliary in

disseminating truth, and as such this meeting has no right to prohibit their publication. We decide,

3. That editors, like those who pursue other occupations, are equally responsible to the church for their conduct and influence. Now, whereas there are many grave objections coming to this meeting raised against the offensive character of articles published in some of our papers, and whereas these editors, or some of them, have been admonished time and again, made promise after promise, and violated them, we therefore, as your committee, recommend that when editors fail to make satisfaction for the offense they thus commit, that Annual Meeting take the matter into consideration and send a committee to wait upon said editors in their own congregations. I. J. Rosenberger, Solomon Buckalew, George Holler, John Flory, Joseph Bowman.

1882 ART. 3. Inasmuch as we look upon the many periodicals, in the way they are conducted, to be very injurious to the cause of our Master, will we have any printed at all in the church? and if so, will we allow them as private enterprises, or will we have them controlled by the church, and that no brother or brethren shall print a periodical for the church without liberty from the General Council of the old brethren? The mind of this meeting is, that as we have but one paper published amongst us that has so far stood loyal to the faith and old order of the church, and as in some instances, and especially at this time, it seems to be needful, we feel to have the publication of the **Vindicator** by Brother Samuel Kinsey continued; and that it be restricted and controlled by the General Council of the brotherhood. We submit the matter to the Yearly Meeting for further consideration. Answer: In order to carry out the work properly, this meeting appoints the three following brethren to assist Brother Kinsey by their counsels: Abraham Flory, Samuel Murray, David Cripe.

(Recon. Min.)

1883 SEC. 6. PERIODICALS. We refuse all minutes on this subject. Endorse the decision of Annual Meeting, 1882, Art. 3. (Accepted).

1890 It was submitted and approved of by the Yearly Meeting of 1890, that Henry and John Garber continue the publishing of the **Vindicator,** the death of Joseph I. Cover occurring since last Yearly Meeting.

1884 To the Brethren Assembled in Annual Council, Greeting:

Inasmuch as the Vindicator counsel, or staff, lost a worthy member and elder, we feel the need of help more than ever, and we ask this Yearly Meeting to add three more elders to said counsel, or staff, and said counsel to be empowered to fill vacancies, change editors, and take full charge of the work to the best interest of the cause of Christ and the church, subject to Annual Meetings. And we further suggest that Brethren William Cassell, J. M. Mohler, and Aaron Frantz be added. Samuel Murray, Henry Garber, John Garber, David Cripe. Passed.

1907 ART. 2. We, the half of the present Vindicator committee, who asked for relief last year, are well aware that the present Vindicator Committee is not giving general satisfaction; and for relief we recommend and ask for an entire new committee, and as past experience has taught us that for convenience those brethren should not live too far apart.

We therefore submit the above to your wise judgment, to grant the request, to amend, to pass upon or to answer and bring before the General Council. William Cassell, Aaron Frantz.

Answer: This standing committee advises the Vindicator Staff to proceed as originated in Annual Meeting of 1882, Article 3, also as approved by Annual Meeting of 1890, and to do as advised and empowered by Annual Meeting of 1894 subjecting same to Annual Meeting for approval after all important changes such as filling vacancies, changing editors, etc. Approved by the Yearly Meeting.

1908 ART. 8. Report of the Vindicator committee to the Yearly Meeting of 1908.

We, your committee on the **Vindicator,** have proceeded as advised by Yearly Meeting of 1907, and have filled the vacancies to the number of seven, by choosing Benjamin A. Frantz, Jonathan Wenrick, and Joseph D. Mohler, as set forth and advised by Yearly Meeting of 1894.

Signed by the following brethren: William Cassell, Aaron Frantz, Henry Garber, Amos Hyre. Approved by this Yearly Meeting.

Public Works, Construction of

1852 ART. 23. Is it right for brethren to take an active part in the construction of public works, such as railroads, turnpikes, plank-roads, and canals, and thereby are instrumental in damaging the property of many citizens? Considered, that brethren ought not to take an active part in any public work, to the injury of private property, but always should do as they would wish to be done unto, and not be entangled with the affairs of this world. II. Tim. ii. 4.

1891 ART. 2. Is it right for members to side in with the world, and sign petitions to force gravel roads, and thereby oppress the poor by imposing heavy taxes upon them? Answer: We think, that in all such cases, brethren should occupy a neutral position, which is, to have nothing to do with it on either side.

Pulpit

1847 ART. 3. Whether it is advisable for brethren, who are teachers, to occupy a stand three or four steps high, when they are invited to hold meetings in the meeting-houses of the different persuasions or sects through our country? Considered advisable that teachers should practice discretion and humility, in taking their stands for speaking, and that members should, also, use forbearance, and not take offense, in such matters, if circumstances would make it preferable for teachers to occupy such a stand.

1848 ART. 2. Whether it be proper to reconsider Art. 3, of last year's minutes, relating to preaching from a stand? Reconsidered, that all our brethren should endeavor, as much as possible, to avoid giving or taking offense.

1851 ART. 23. Is it right for our teachers to enter up into pulpits, in other denominations' meeting-houses, and teach there? Considered, that brethren should give no offense, neither to Jew nor Gentile, nor to the church of Christ; but we would advise brethren not to go up, when they can avoid it, as the brethren had considered once before.

1863 ART. 15. Is it in accordance with the gospel to have stands or pulpits erected in our meeting-houses? We have no direct gospel upon this subject, but we advise the brethren not to put pulpits or stands in their houses of worship, when by so doing confusion and disunion may be produced.

1866 ART. 23. Inasmuch as there is a difference of opinion among the brethren in reference to what constitutes a reasonable excuse for going upon stands or pulpits in meeting-houses of other denominations, will the brethren in Annual Council give a more definite answer upon this subject? Answer: We recommend the brethren to bear with one another, allowing every brother to keep his conscience clear, as we have no "thus saith the Lord" for it.

1868 ART. 15. Can there not be a more scriptural answer on the article of going on stands to preach, than that passed in our Annual Meeting in 1866, Art. 23? Answer: We can give no better answer to it than that already given in the minutes of 1866. Art. 23.

1873 ART. 12. This district-meeting requests the Annual Meeting of 1873 to reconsider Art. 15, of the minutes of 1868, touching the propriety of brethren going on stands to preach. Answer: Let this matter rest as it now is.

1875 ART. 23. We request this district and the Annual Meeting to give us a more definite decision on the stand question, so that the brethren may become more united in this long-agitated question. The way matters are now, heaven can not be pleased with us. While some go upon stands, others stay down. If God's law teaches us to go on stands to preach, why not all go on them? And if he teaches us to stay down, why not all stay down? Let us have the gospel order in this as well as in all other matters. Let God's law be the man of our counsel in all matters. Answer: We think we can give no more satisfactory answer upon this subject than what we already have in the minutes of our Annual Meeting, especially in that of Art. 23, of the minutes of 1866.

(Recon. Min.)

1883 SEC. 10. PULPIT OR STANDS. Going up on stands to preach in meeting-houses of other persuasions. We retain the minutes of 1851, Art. 23, it being one which expresses the order of our fathers, and is best suited to be governed by under such trying occasions. This committee adopted with this amendment, substituting the word "reasonably" before the word "avoid," so as to make it read thus: "When they can reasonably avoid it." All others pertaining to our meeting-houses, void. This meeting confirmed the substituting of the Amendment offered. (Accepted.)

Radio

1925 ART. 1. (a) Inasmuch as the modern invention and use of radio is becoming very popular in the world, is it according to the life and teachings of Christ and allowable by the church for members to own or have in their possession the radio? Col. 2:21, 22. Luke 16:15. Romans 12:2.

(b) We pray this Annual Meeting while assembled together in the Spirit and power of his might, to seriously consider the propriety of members allowing radios in their houses principally for the purpose of amusement and entertainment and at the same time connecting our houses with the fast current of the world. The radio is becoming highly esteemed among men, if so an abomination in the sight of God. John says, "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world." James says, "Keep yourselves unspotted from the world." The Savior says, "My kingdom is not of this world." We are commanded to set our affections on things above, not on things on the earth. Can we consistently bring up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord and at the same time let them idle away their time with the use of the radio? Therefore we earnestly pray this Annual Meeting to give us some definite rule to be governed by so as to clean up our houses and be a light to the world and living epistles known and read of all men. Answer: This Annual Meeting unitedly agrees that the radio is not in harmony with the life and teaching of Christ, and therefore, not allowable by the church under present conditions; and we cannot break bread with members who will not heed the above.

1926 ART. 3. In a local district of church it was reported that a brother and sister had a radio in their home. Upon investigation it was found to be so. A radio equipped with head phones belonging to their son, a single man past 21 years of age, who was farming the place and making his home with his father and mother, was in their house. The father and mother will not ask their son to take the radio out of the home for fear he will leave home, and they will not refuse to listen on the radio for fear he will get a loud speaker; but they will promise to listen to such things only that are fit to be listened to.

The matter is brought before the church in regular order, the sister not present. The counsel or vote was taken. Seventeen say, "We ask nothing." Seventeen say, "We will be with the church." Five say, "We will hold for the decision of Annual Meeting on the radio." Some of the seventeen that say, "We ask nothing," say, "We think the brother should use his influence against the radio and not listen on it." The brother is called in and told, "The church asks nothing of you, but thinks you should use your influence against the radio, and we think it would be best for you not to listen on the radio."

Is the above decision in harmony with the Gospel and the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1925 on the radio? If not what should be done? Answer: To the first part of the query which reads, "Is the above decision in harmony with the Gospel and the decision of Annual Meeting of 1925 on the radio?" we say, No. As to the latter part of the query which asks, "If not, what shall be done?" we refer to Article 3, 1925. Passed.

1928 ART. 4. We would respectfully call the attention of this Annual Meeting to an error. By some misunderstanding the recommendation of the sub-committee on Art. 3 of 1926 was written into the minutes after that Annual Meeting, in open council, had decided that the query should be laid down, thus by this error binding the affected district to a course almost unanimously considered unjust. Answer: We unanimously agree that we cannot find an error in minutes of 1926, Art. 3 which was passed, and still refer to minutes of 1925, Art. 1. Passed.

1934 ART. 7. Inasmuch as all kinds of musical instruments have never been tolerated in the homes of our dear members in our fraternity, according to the Resolutions and the Reconsidered Minutes of 1883 and 1884, and also the minutes of 1920, Art. 1 and Art. 2, which strictly forbid the use of victrolas or talking machines, etc., and again in 1925, Art. 1, the A. M. unitedly agreed that the radio is not in harmony with the life and teaching of Christ, and therefore not allowable by the Church under present conditions and cannot break bread with members **who** will not heed the above. We therefore earnestly pray that the A. M. of 1934 reconsider the propriety of the use of the radio amongst our members as it is slowly creeping into the church. And give us a more definite answer as to how long we can bear with members that refuse to heed the above counsel. Answer: We unitedly agree not to reconsider the propriety of the use of the radio among our members and strongly recommend a strict adherence to the minutes of A. M. Art. 1, 1925. Passed.

1937 ART. 10. (1) As radios are becoming more numerous in the Brotherhood and inasmuch as Annual Meeting has said that members who have them cannot break the bread of communion, is it right that such members be in council or other matters that come before the church while they are out of communion? (2) Inasmuch as the councils of our yearly meetings only give advice instead of making unalterable laws, as held forth by our old fathers (See Appendix. See Sec. 44) we ask this A. M. to consider the following minutes. The united decisions of A. M. of 1913 on the telephone question (See Art. 1) are applicable on the radio question. Therefore, we kindly request that our A. M. fully consider this reasonable answer, and stop the confused condition on the radio question, since we have no Scripture to bar any member from the communion for having a radio in his home.

Answer: To first query, Yes. To second query, After careful consideration we unitedly agree that the minutes on the telephone, referred to, are not applicable to the radio. Therefore, we unitedly agree to reaffirm the answer of Article 1, 1925, on the radio. Passed by the meeting.

1942 ART. 4. Inasmuch as our A. M. unitedly agreed that the radio is not in harmony with the life and teaching of Christ and therefore not allowable by the church under present conditions, and we cannot break bread with members who will not pay heed to the above, how should such members be dealt with who do not pay heed to the above by going to communion at home or in other districts? Also how should such an elder or elders be dealt with who allow members to go to the communion table at home or in other districts, and allow members from other districts to commune with them that do not pay heed to the above or that have a radio in their home?

Answer: In answer to the first part we unitedly agree that members communing in violation of Art. 1, 1925 and Art. 7, 1934, should be dealt with as transgressors. In answer to the second part, elders allowing members to commune in violation of the above minutes shall be considered transgressors and out of communion. Passed by the meeting.

Railroad Privileges, and Stocks

1858 ART. 28. Is it consistent with the word of God for the followers of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ to make arrangements with railroad companies to obtain the benefit of half-fare, in going to and returning from the Yearly Meeting? Considered, that it is right for brethren to avail themselves of the privilege offered by the railroad companies, but we will advise all our brethren to comply with the rules of the companies, and if a misunderstanding should occur, not to contend, but rather pay full fare.

1864 ART. 40. Resolved, that this meeting returns its thanks to such railroad companies as have granted the favor of excursion tickets for their kindness.

1873 ART. 9. Is it according to the gospel, or is it conforming to the world, when brethren subscribe for railroad stock?

Answer: We know of no direct Scripture forbidding it; but inasmuch as it brings us into associations in which we are liable to violate Christian principles, we would not advise brethren to engage in it.

1931 ART. 6. Inasmuch as the Summer Special Rates between Los Angeles and Chicago have been commenced on the 22nd of May in the past and come too late for most of our Annual Meetings one of the traveling passenger agents has asked that there be a query sent to our Annual Meeting requesting that that meeting appoint a committee to confer with the proper authorities of the Western Division of Railroads (Traffic Manager) and see if said rates could not be changed to May 15 in place of May 22, from Los Angeles to Chicago, thereby being early enough for all of our Annual Meetings, explaining to said manager that our meetings come on Whit Sunday regardless of date. Will this A. M. grant this request and appoint a committee of three or five brethren, as it will mean a great saving to the members and others attending our Annual Meetings from the west? Answer: This A. M. of 1931 grants to the churches of California the privilege to appoint a committee to confer with the Western Passenger Association as to the change of the above dates. Passed.

Rebaptism

1827 ART. 3. Concerning receiving persons who have been baptized in the proper manner by other denominations. Considered, that those who have been received before with the laying on of hands (and prayer), we receive with hand and kiss, and those on whom the laying of hands had not been observed, we should receive by the laying on of hands, etc., etc.

1832 ART. 6. How is it considered concerning persons who wish to be received, and had already been immersed but once by other Baptists? Considered, that some have been received without baptism, as we believe it ought to be performed, and they afterward came of their own accord to receive the baptism according to the word.

1838 ART. 13. Whether persons that have been baptized formerly elsewhere with a threefold immersion, could be received among us as members without baptism or not? Considered almost unanimously, that when such persons are satisfied with their baptism, having been performed in the right manner, they may be received as members without baptism, yet with stating to them the order (rules, principles) of the brethren, and the laying on of hands. If they should, however, desire baptism, it might be granted to their satisfaction.

1866 ART. 8. A man was baptized by the brethren, but he afterward left the church, with the plea that he never believed there was a God and that he joined the church for worldly gain; but afterward he wishes to join the church, and be baptized, and says he now believes in Christ, and lives as becomes a Christian. Can he be received without being re-baptized? It is considered best to defer this question to the next Annual Meeting.

1867 ART. 34. Art. 8, as it stands on the minutes of the Yearly Meeting for 1866, relates to a brother who had expressed a desire to be re-baptized. Considered by this district-meeting that the case be referred to the church in which it exists, and the brethren there be authorized by the Yearly Meeting to proceed as the nature of the case may require. Referred.

1868 ART. 12. What is to be done with a person who makes application to come into the church, confessing that he has truly repented, received faith in Christ, and upon that faith has been baptized by a trine immersion for the remission of his sins by another denomination? Answer: We think it best to make no change in reference to the subject alluded to in the article, from the present order of the brethren. (See Minutes of 1848, Art. 5.)

1870 ART. 13. A sister was received into the church years ago by single immersion, but upon the agitation of the subject, the question arises, can she be retained as a member of the church? Answer: We consider that the gospel, and our consistency in regard to our practice of the gospel, require us to adhere strictly to our mode of immersion, as recognized in the minutes of our Annual Meeting. (See Minutes of 1841, Art. 5.)

1877 ART. 27. Will this district meeting petition the Annual Meeting to readopt the answer of Annual Meeting of 1827, Article 3, and also of Annual Meeting of 1838, Article 13, so as to receive members of other denominations who have been baptized by a valid baptism, that is, by trine immersion? Answer: This Annual Meeting decides not to adopt the minutes alluded to in the query.

1879 ART. 22. The Eastern District of Pennsylvania and the annual conference are hereby warmly and heartily entreated to give us the privilege to receive properly haptized persons without rebaptizing them, if they are conscientious about receiving a second baptism. Some churches suffer, if we must keep house according to the decision of the minutes of 1848. Can not the brethren be allowed to keep house according to former usage in case there is a strong majority so minded? Answer: We decide to abide by the decision of 1848.

1881 ART. 3. A brother was baptized while sick, not by his own request, but by the over persuasion of his friends, and as soon as he began to recover, regretted it, and became dissatisfied, thinking his baptism was illegal and unsatisfactory to himself, and wishes to be baptized. Can it be done consistently with the gospel? Answer: If his mind was affected to such an extent through sickness that he could not exercise faith and repentance, he might be rebaptized on his subsequent profession of faith and repentance.

1890 ART. 1. Inasmuch as query No. 5, of 1882, is not alike understood by all the brethren, therefore, as an amendment to the aforesaid query No. 5, of 1882, we ask this Annual Meeting whether we can receive into our fellowship any one that has been baptized by any of the "Conservative" or "Progressive" Brethren after the separation has been made in any local church in the brotherhood without being re-baptized? (See I. Cor. xii. 12, 13.) Answer: As an amendment to item 9, of query No. 5, of 1882, we say that all such should be re-baptized before we could raceive them into church fellowship.

1921 ART. 2. First, Inasmuch as Art. 5, A. M., 1902, is far reaching, we ask this A. M. of 1921, that it consider said article and say that we cannot receive into our fellowship any one that has been baptized by any other religious fraternity without being rebaptized.

Second. We ask Annual Meeting to reconsider the minutes of 1882, Art. 5, 1890, Art. 1, 1908, Art. 5, and give an answer more in harmony with 1 Cor. 12:13, that all may understand alike and all practice alike, and not receive into church fellowship applicants baptized by other denominations, on their baptism. Answer: This Annual Meeting decides to grant the request of both the above queries, viz., that all minutes named therein be reconsidered, and says, We cannot receive into fellowship any that are baptized by any other organization from this date of passage, without rebaptism. See 1 Cor. 12:13. Passed.

1924 ART. 3. Inasmuch as the answers to queries Nos. 1 and 2, Article 2, 1921, is not understood alike by all, therefore, we pray this Annual Meeting to reconsider the answer to the above named queries and drop the words: "From this date of passage," so as to make it more definite and that all may understand alike.

We further pray this Annual Meeting to make provision for certain cases in districts wherein no separation has taken place in our once united fraternity, allowing it to the discretion of local churches (in addition to advice of adjoining elders) whether or not to recognize baptism administered by Church of of the Brethren: all such applicants for membership to be required to accept the Resolutions of August 24, 1881. Answer: We agree to reconsider queries Nos. 1 and 2, Article 2, minutes of 1921 and answer to the same, and decide that all who were baptized before the general separation may be received into fellowship without rebaptism by accepting the Resolutions of 1881 and the general principles of our fraternity. Further, All who have been baptized since the general separation must be received only by rebaptism. Passed.

1932 ART. 2. Inasmuch as there are sincere, earnest hearts among the Conservatives (Church of the Brethren) who realize the downfall of Christian piety and fidelity among their people, and who are anxious to unite with our Fraternity upon their former baptism, will this A. M. reconsider the latter clause of Article 3 in Minutes of A. M., 1924, which reads as follows:

"We further pray this Annual Meeting to make provision for certain cases in districts wherein no separation has taken place in our once united fraternity, allowing it to the discretion of local churches (in addition to advice of adjoining elders) whether or not to recognize baptism administered by the Church of the Brethren: all such applicants for membership to be required to accept the Resolutions of August 24th, 1881." Refer to Luke 9:49, 50; John 10:16; also Rev. 3:4. Answer: We unanimously agree to make no change. Passed.

Receiving Fallen Members (See Excluding)

1834 ART. 12. If a brother who is a minister should transgress so that the church has to set him back, and if he is afterwards received again upon his acknowledgment, whether he is to be received with or without his office? Considered, that depends upon the church, and also upon the nature of his transgression.

1838 ART. 6. Whether it be right to receive again as a private member a brother that was a teacher, and had been put back, without intrusting him again with the office? Considered, that a congregation has a right to do in such a case as it seemeth good to them.

1840 ART. 13. About receiving again members that had been excluded; in what manner it ought to take place? Considered, that it was hitherto not done the same way as the reception of newly-elected teachers or deacons, where the members do advance toward those elected, but that it was and is the mode of the brethren, the members to remain in their places, and the member to be received again to go from one to the other, and thus be received, if a brother, by the brethren with hand and kiss, and by the sisters with the hand; and if a sister, by the brethren with the hand, and by the sisters with hand and kiss.

Special
1846 ART. 1. How, and whether a brother can be received who had been expelled from the church for selling and bill-of-saleing away his slaves, and afterward wishes to be received again? Considered, that such a brother can not be reinstated until he has used every exertion in his power to liberate them, and make full satisfaction to the church.

1852 ART. 22. If a member leaves the church and joins another denomination, and after a while leaves that denomination and makes application to be received back into the church again, has the church a right to receive that member again? Considered, that by acknowledging his or her fault, and giving satisfaction to the church, he may be received again.

1854 ART. 7. Can a person be reinstated into the church after having been excluded for immoral conduct, when he holds the opinion that the sisters have no voice in church-council? Considered, better not receive such, as long as they entertain views contrary to the order of the church.

1858 ART. 47. How is it considered, in the case of a brother who has been expelled from the church, and then takes up with a woman that has a husband living, and lives with her fifteen years; then her husband dies, and the two get lawfully married, and now he has made application to be taken into the church, and we desire the Yearly Meeting to give counsel what to do? Considered, that he may be received, provided he brings forth fruit meet for repentance.

1859 ART. 33. If a member of a church moves from one congregation into another, and is afterward called back again by the said congregation from which he moved, for some offense, and is expelled; he then applies for membership to the congregation he now lives in, but is sent back by it to the congregation that expelled him to see whether it could release him or be reconciled with him, and it does release him upon his confession and repentance. Now which congregation is to receive him into membership? Answer: He should be received by the same church that expelled him, and that church should give him a certificate, and that will give him a membership in the church to which he has removed.

1860 ART. 2. Ought not Art. 33 of the minutes of 1859, be reconsidered? (The article referred to is this: "If a member of a church move from one congregation into another, and is afterward called back again by the said congregation from which he had moved, for some offense, and is expelled; he then applies for membership to the congregation he now lives in, but is sent back by it to the congregation that expelled him, to see whether it could release him, or be reconciled with him, and it does release him upon his confession and repentance. Now, which congregation is to receive him into membership?") Answer: The expelled member must be received by the church that expelled him, or make full satisfaction to that church, in person or by letter, and then he can be received into the church in which he lives.

1861 ART. 9. When expelled members, upon application, are readmitted, how shall they be received by the church? Considered, that the applicating member be received by the hand of fellowship and the kiss of charity; but that the (reinstated) brother or sister go around to all the members, and (in order to) be received by them.

1865 ART. 20. Is it according to the spirit of the gospel to receive expelled penitent members, as directed by the Annual Meeting of 1840, Article 13, which reads thus: "It was, and is, the mode of the brethren for the members to remain in their places, and the members to be received again, to go from one to another, and thus to be received," etc. Answer: We think there is no necessity for a change in the manner of receiving fallen members.

1866 ART. 43. Would it be more consistent with the teaching of the gospel, in receiving disowned members, for the members of the church to go to the disowned members, and receive them, than for the disowned members to go around to the members of the church, and be received by them in that way? Answer: Inasmuch as we find that the practice laid down in the minutes, referred to above, has not been a general one hitherto, and as it seems a union of sentiment can not be effected at this meeting, we would feel to leave the matter optional with the churches for the present.

1870 ART. 24. What is the rule of the brethren, when a member is expelled, and removes into another or adjoining district, and after living in the other district some six or seven years, and then makes application for membership, which church shall then receive him with hand and kiss, after reconciliation is made with the church that expelled him? Answer: The church in which he lives at the time he is restored.

1872 ART. 9. Is it right, according to the gospel and rules of the brethren, for one arm of the church to delegate to another arm the power of restoring back to the church a member who had formerly been disowned by the arm first named above? Answer: It has the power, by sending the charge with the testimony, in connection with the testimony where the member resides.

1882 ART. 4. How do the old brethren consider it in case any expelled members, or applicants otherwise, wish to be received into the church? Can they be received without the unanimous consent of all members present? Answer: We decide that such should be received by unanimous consent, or without opposition, which is the old established order.

Receiving Members From "Conservative" and "Progressive" Bodies

1882 ART. 5. Inasmuch as we are much opposed, since the division, by some of the so-called "conservative" and "progressive" brethren, upon what conditions can we admit such into the churuch in case any should change their minds and wish to stand with us in the old faith and principles of the church? Say, first, such as were in the elder's office at the time of division; second, such as were advanced to that office since; third, such as were in the second degree; fourth, such as were advanced to the second degree since; fifth, such as stood in the first degree; sixth, such as were elected to the first degree; seventh, such as were elected to the visit; eighth, such as stand as private members; ninth, and such as were baptized and received as members by them? The above named has reference only to those who opposed us, and took an active part against us. Answer: In answer to the above questions, this meeting unanimously decides that it can not regard the work of those of our strong opposers, as above named, in any of the several parts as stated; and that such as stood in office at the time of the division in their districts would have to be received as private members, after making full acknowledgments, according to their transgressions and actions taken against us. And as regards those who have taken no definite action nor stand against us, we can cheerfully, upon their request, receive them into fellowship, and hold them as full members of the church. The above answer, as made by the district meeting, is confirmed and unanimously accepted by the General Conference.

Receiving Sick Persons Without Baptism

1827 ART. 4. Concerning receiving sick persons who can not be baptized on account of their sickness and weakness, was considered, that they might be received, and if they should die, they might die as members, but if they should live and be well again, they should and would be baptized.

1837 ART. 12. How is it viewed to receive persons into the church without baptism, in case of sickness and bodily infirmity? Considered, that we have no express of words for it, and that it would be more advisable and more safe to direct them to the mercy of God in Christ. Yet we would in certain singular cases not set bounds, but advise all teachers to be careful to do nothing without the counsel of their fellow laborers, and, if it be possible, of their church.

1860 ART. 4. Shall it be an order among the brethren to receive persons into the church as members, when they are sick, without baptism, with the promise that they will be baptized when they get well? Answer: Let persons who wish to be received into the church, and who are too sick to have the ordinance of baptism administered to them, be considered candidates for baptism, to receive the ordinance as soon as circumstances will permit, but not in full membership until they are baptized.

(Special)

1848 ART. 10. What is the proper course for a church to pursue with members that have been disowned by the church, and their office, as teachers in the church taken from them, and yet, contrary to the counsel of the church, they still go on to hold meetings, and influence innocent members to go contrary to the rules and order of the church? Considered, that such a brother should be still lovingly and faithfully admonished, again and again, to desist from such a course; but if he would, notwithstanding, continue therein, we would have, as a last remedy, to put him in avoidance.

(Special)

1848 ART. 11. When the church disowns a member, so that it is set back from the salutation of the kiss, and from church fellowship, how is the proper way to do with such members as come from other arms of the church, and, knowing the standing of such disowned members, yet will still hold fellowship with such? Considered, that, inasmuch as the church of Christ is one body, all over the world, and the Word even says, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosened in heaven," if one branch of this church disowns a member, members from other branches, knowing this, should hold them equally as disowned.

Resolutions

1866 ART. 47. The following resolution was proposed to the Annual Meeting, by a district meeting, with a request that it be adopted:

Resolved by this Annual Meeting, That the churches throughout the brotherhood enforce plainness of dress, and a plain manner of wearing the hair and beard, upon the preachers and officers of the churches. By plainness of dress, we mean, the common order of giving shape to dress, as practiced by the old brethren and sisters generally, and by plainness of hair we mean the hair parted on the top of the head, or all combed back in a plain manner, or combed straight down all around the head, and not having the hair and beard trimmed according to the custom of the world. Considered, that this Annual Meeting unanimously adopt this resolution, according to Rom. xii. 2; I. Peter i. 14; I. John ii. 15, 16; and that all preachers and officers that follow the fashions of the world in the foregoing particulars, violate the order of the gospel by doing so, and render themselves liable to be brought under the counsel of the church.

1867 ART. 4. A request to change the word **enforce**, in Art. 47 of 1866, to **advise.** Answer: We consider it not best to change the word in the connection in which it stands, as it applies to the officers of the church, for whom it was designed.

Refreshment Stands

1900 ART. 1. Will not this Annual Meeting advise our dear members not to grant any stand rights of any kind on their premises at our Annual Meeting, or at our communion meeting? Answer: We advise that brethren having control of grounds either at annual or communion meetings use all reasonable means in keeping such stands at such distance as not to disturb the meetings.

1927 ART. 1. (a) Past experience has proven that when the privilege is granted for some one to conduct a refreshment stand or stands on our Annual Meeting grounds, almost invariably the rules governing the manner in which such stands should be controlled have been ignored and the controlling power has been changed from the grantor to the grantee, resulting in a "County Fair" condition, causing much unfavorable comment by the world and casting a shadow over the better light that should be manifested by the people of God when assembled together to consider the sacred principles that mean so much for the spiritual progress of the Church. Further: It seems contrary to Christ's teachings for a sacred assembly working for his cause, becoming an excuse for merchandising. See John 2:16. It is also reasonable to conclude especially under conditions of this kind that **fasting** is much more consistent than **feasting.**

In view of the above reasons and more that might be given, we would ask this Annual Meeting to reconsider Art. 1, Annual Meeting of 1900, also Art. 1, of Annual Meeting of 1923, and conclude that from now on he upon whose premises these meetings are held (also others), should forfeit the right to let refreshment stands of any kind upon said premises.

(b) Inasmuch as the lunch stands at our Annual Meetings are being allowed more privileges, and are continually locating nearer the Meeting Tents; also being allowed to sell soft bottled drinks; all of which is becoming grievous to many of our members who feel these practices are not in harmony with our humble and non conforming profession, and the Scriptures; Therefore we earnestly pray this Annual Meeting to give its prayerful consideration to the above and especially to prohibit the sale of soft or bottled drinks; which, if indulged in by our beloved members, shows a very bad light in the world. See Matt. 5:16; also I Thess. 5:22. Answer: We reaffirm minutes of 1900 and 1923 with advice to the committee of arrangements to more fully adhere to said minutes. Passed.

Respect to Aged

1880 ART. 4. Inasmuch as the Scriptures enjoin respect to the aged, (see Lev. xix. 32; I. Tim. v. 1,) we ask the district meeting to petition Annual Meeting for our young official brethren, youthful editors, etc., to permit our aged brethren at Annual Meeting to occupy seats with and near the Standing Committee, where they have better opportunity to hear the proceedings, and also to give counsel. Answer: We think the young should do so.

Restoration Doctrine

1849 ART. 30. Whether it is advisable for a brother to preach universal redemption publicly; that is, that all men, how vile soever they may have been, shall share alike in the fruition of happiness with the saints? Considered, that we could not approve, by any means, of such preaching.

1858 ART. 2. Is it according to the gospel of Christ for brethren, especially bishops, in speaking on the final destinies of the ungodly, to preach publicly that they shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and privately teach that all will be restored everlastingly, whether they know God and obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ or not? And if asked the question by an alien whether the devil himself will be saved, make no reply? Answer: We think brethren should be careful not to contradict privately what they preach publicly.

1858 ART. 3. Is it consistent to preach eternal punishment, at the same time to peddle Winchester's Dialogues on Restoration? Tell us how it is. Answer: If a brother preaches eternal punishment, it would be inconsistent for him to distribute Winchester's Dialogues on the Restoration.

1875 ART.33. How is it looked at by our fraternity for a minister of ours to preach and debate publicly in favor of final restoration of all men. Answer: Brethren should not do so.

1878 ART. 9. We ask the Annual Meeting, through the district meeting, to stop the brethren in publishing and selling books in favor of or against the doctrine of universal restoration. Answer: We grant the request herein asked for.

1902 ART. 3. Inasmuch as the publishing of views on final restoration of the wicked is being done of late years, both by printing and preaching, thereby causing serious contention, wounding feelings of members, and menacing the brotherhood, will not this Yearly Meeting urge against its further agitation, and reaffirm the minds of the brethren in Yearly Meetings of 1849, Article 30; 1858, Articles 2 and 3; and 1875, Article 33? Answer: We, your sub-committee on Article 3, unitedly agree to reaffirm the articles referred to in the above query, and we advise all our dear brethren to preach the Word, as referred to in 2 Tim. 4. 1, 2. Passed.

Returning Thanks

1853 ART. 36. How is it considered when a brother, at a love-feast, or meeting where dinners are given, having been at the first table, where a blessing was asked, and thanks returned orderly, afterward rises, and returns thanks at the second or third table? **Considered**. that it had better not been done.

Revision of Minutes

1882 ART. 1. Would it not be advisable for the district meeting to petition the Annual Meeting to revise the minutes? This meeting thinks it would be advisable to do so, and thereby strike out all the decisions that have given encouragement to changes and deviations from the old established order and practice of the church. We do, therefore, submit the matter to the Yearly Meeting to make the proper arrangements for this work. Answer: This Yearly Meeting unanimously accepts the above, and in order to make the arrangements and thus mature this very important work, we appoint the following committee of seven brethren, who shall take the matter into serious charge: G. V. Siler, of Ohio; A. H. Sensney, of Maryland; Jacob Metzger, of Indiana; John Harshey, of Missouri; Samuel Musselman, of Iowa; Joseph Cripe, of Illinois; Samuel Murray, of Ohio. Said committee to convene and make a report of their labors to the next Yearly Meeting for acceptance or amendment.

Reward on Stolen Goods

1866 ART. 32. Is it agreeable with the gospel for brethren to put a reward on their horses or other property when stolen, and try to recover the same? Answer: It is not according to Luke vi. 30.

1867 ART. 14. Is it expedient for brethren to put a reward on their property, when stolen, and try to recover the same?

Answer: We consider the Scripture to be satisfactory in the above case, without human expediency. Luke vi. 30.

Spiritual Rappings

1852 ART. 10. Has a brother, who is a speaker, a right to go to so-called spiritual rappings, and ask such questions as these: "Are the ordinances of the gospel essential to salvation?" "Are certain deceased relatives happy?" etc., and to invite the so-called medium into his neighborhood, who thereupon calls at such brother's house, and neighbors, and also members, attend there, asking and receiving information from such medium? How is such a brother to be dealt with, according to gospel? Considered, that such rappings are a lying wonder and delusion, and that these things have been strongly forbidden, both in the Old and New Testament, as the works of the devil. (See Deut. xviii. 9-16; Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6. 27; Is. viii. 19, 20; Acts xvi. 16-18; Luke xi. 14; II. Thess. ii. 9-11; Rev. xiii. 13.) And where any brother goes so far as stated above, he should be admonished, and ought to make satisfactory acknowledgments to the church, and all the members should be earnestly admonished to have nothing to do with it, and totally to debar it from among them.

Secret Societies

1804 ART. 6. What is to be done with brethren who join the Freemasons? Though we are not sufficiently acquainted with this (secret) association to judge in the case, still there are revealed many trifling things, frivolities, and unfruitful works, so that it is considered highly improper for brethren to be members in their association, or to have fellowship with their works; therefore it has been unanimously concluded that in case there are brethren defiled therewith, they should be admonished in heartfelt love, and informed that if they wanted to be (remain) in fellowship with these (masonic) brethren, we could not have fellowship with them; and if after such admonition they would not hear or receive counsel, we would have to avoid them, and could have no fellowship with them. But if one were contaminated with this, and would repent from the heart (and renounce all further fellowship with that association) in faith and hope, he might be received again in the name of Jesus Christ.

1828 ART. 1. Whether a brother can belong to the Freemasons and still be a brother (in the church)? Considered, that it can not be.

1847 ART. 10. Would it be proper for brethren to join the secret association of the Sons of Temperance? Considered, inasmuch as we are to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good," and as the nature of secret societies is such as to preclude the knowledge of them, before a membership is obtained, we consider it improper for a member of the church to join such an order.
(Special)

1848 ART. 5. Whether brethren, and especially teachers, can, consistently with the gospel and our holy profession, attach themselves to the Freemasons, and the society popularly called the Sons of Temperance, and if not consistent, how the church is to proceed in such a case? Considered, that, whereas, the Holy Spirit testifies bythe Apostle Paul (I. Cor. xi. 29) "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body;" and, whereas, we are informed in Holy Writ, that the Lord's body is his church—of which we desire to be members—and he is the head; * * * that from such and other considerations and declarations of the word of God, the brethren have always believed, and do still believe, that it is not only unbecoming and wrong, but highly dangerous, for brethren to attach themselves to such secret societies, or any association of that world, and if they should do so, they should be visited in love (as the advice was forty-four years ago, in a Yearly Meeting at Pipe Creek), and admonished to withdraw themselves from such, and if they should acknowledge their fault before the church, the members might bear with them. But in case of a minister of the Word having gone so far, not only to attach himself to such secret societies, but also to act as their chaplain and orator, it was considered, that such a brother ought to be silent in the church, until the members should feel renewed confidence in him again.

1852 ART. 27. Is it according to the gospel to receive a man into the church, belonging to the order of Odd Fellows? Considered, that it is not, unless he is willing to withdraw from and renounce that order.

1855 ART. 3. How is it considered, if a brother, or brethren, belong to the party so-called "Know-Nothings," and take an active part in it, trying to persuade brethren to join said party? Considered, that no brother, who is a member of the so-called Know-Nothings, or any other secret society, can be a member of our communion.

1855 ART. 19. What to do with a person wishing to become a member, and confessing to be a Freemason, yet not willing to renounce it? Considered, that no person could, or should, be admitted into the church, unless he shall previously renounce all connection whatsoever with Freemasonry, or any and every other secret society, with which he may have been connected.

1859 ART. 4. As secret societies seem to be multiplying, and as many young men around us join them, and as some undertake a defense of them, it seems necessary that our minds need to be frequently stirred up upon this matter. Then, as we profess to be followers of Him who said, "In secret have I done nothing," will the Yearly Meeting, through its proceedings, come up to the side of our Lord? Answer: We consider that members should not participate in any secret or oath-bound societies whatever; and if, after they have been duly admonished, they persist in such participation, we consider the church is justifiable in excommunicating them.

1862 ART. 11. Inasmuch as there are so many secret societies, such as Freemasons, Odd-Fellows, Sons of Temperance, etc., and as the members of Christ's church are not allowed to belong to any of them, would it not be best to ask all applicants for membership whether they belong to any secret order; and if they do, to inform them that they must renounce all such before they are received into the church?

1866 ART. 40. How is it considered if a neighboring church still holds persons as members who joined a secret society, without calling them to answer for their conduct, the elders knowing such to be the case? Shall we go to their communion, or invite them to ours? Considered not according to II. Cor. vi. 14.

1869 ART. 6. As our fraternity disapproves of its members joining the Masonic order, and all secret societies, when a report is in circulation that some of the brethren belong to some such society, and the nature of the case being such that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to obtain testimony to prove the charge, has the church, under such circumstances, a right to question the brethren charged relative to the truth of the report, and if it has a right to do so, and exercises that right, and the brethren refuse to answer what shall the church do? Answer: Under the circumstances alluded to, we consider that the church has a right to question the brethren, to ascertain whether the report is true, and we think such brethren owe it in honor to themselves, and in justice to the church, to give a direct answer upon the subject, and failing to do so, they throw themselves liable to be dealt with as offending members.

1870 ART. 12. Would it not be prudent, since secret orders, such as Freemasons, Odd-Fellows, etc., are becoming more and more prevalent, to ask every applicant for baptism whether he belongs to any secret order? Answer: We consider it necessary and prudent to do so.

1871 ART. 34. Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting of 1870. Art. 12, has decided that applicants for baptism should be asked whether they belong to any secret order, and as our fraternity is opposed to all secret societies, would it not be well to adopt some plan by which the members may be interrogated yearly, before we hold our communion meetings, upon the subject of secret organizations? Answer: We consider it necessary to interrogate members upon the subject alluded to in the query, where there is any reason to believe they belong to secret societies, but any thing further we think unnecessary.

1878 ART. 13. Inasmuch as Freemasons are under oath to always hail, ever conceal, and never reveal the secrets of the institution, even after abandoning the lodge, we hereby ask whether ex-Masons are eligible to the ministerial office? Answer: We think they are, as we receive them as brethren when they abandon the order, and if we receive them as such, we can not with propriety deny their eligibility to the ministry, if they are otherwise considered worthy.

1879 ART. 11. Since the Annual Meeting of 1878 has decided that ex-Masons who abandon the order are eligible to the ministerial office, we ask this meeting to decide whether such ex-Masons shall be required to disregard their oath, or whether they may continue to "hail" the institution of Freemasonry? Answer: Yes, they shall be required to disregard their Masonic oath with reference to hailing the institution of Freemasonry.

1872 ART. 8. Can the church tolerate a member in the body that is a member of the society or order called Grange or Patrons of Husbandry? Answer: No brother or sister should have any thing to do with an order, it being a secret-bound, and from appearance, a political association; and members who have united with it, and persist in it, should be dealt with as transgressors. (See Minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1870.)

1878 ART. 3. Will this district meeting petition Annual Meeting to reconsider Article 8 of minutes of Annual Meeting of 1872, concerning the "Grange," as we are informed that it is not an oath-binding or political association? It was agreed to forward the foregoing to the Annual Meeting, and in addition to it, to ask the General Conference to give us the more objectionable features of the "Grange," whether it be oath or secretism. Answer: We can not reconsider said query, because both the oath and the secretism are contrary to the gospel. (Matt. x 17; John xviii. 20; II. Cor. vi. 15-18; Eph. iv. 10-12.)

1874 ART. 22. Is it consistent with the gospel, or the order of the brethren, to join the farmer's club, and even act as officers in the same? Answer: Not consistent with the gospel to unite with any organized body of the world, and any member that will not abandon it, after being admonished so to do, shall be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

Selling Books at Annual Meeting

1866 ART. 18. Should not brethren, according to the gospel, be prohibited from selling and circulating books, circulars, etc., at our Annual Meetings—hymn-books and Bibles excepted? Answer: We think the gospel does not prohobit us from selling books comporting with the gospel, and approved by the brethren. But we consider it not consistent to do so on the Sabbath-day.

Slavery

1782 Concerning the unchristian negro slave trade, it has been unanimously considered that it can not be permitted in any wise by the church, that a member should or could purchase negroes, or keep them as slaves. But concerning Brother John Van L., who had bought a considerable time since a negro wench, and the same has given birth already, during that time, to four children by fornication, it is the united and cordial counsel of the brethren that the said Brother L. shall let the old negro wench go free from this time on, and shall tell her that she is free; but if she will not leave him after he has given her liberty, then he may enter with her into a contract for her wages. But this setting free or emancipation shall be done before some brethren, as witnesses of the transaction. Concerning the children, it is also unitedly considered that he is to give the children free at the age of twenty-one years, and is to have them schooled and provided with (food), raiment, and bedding during the time, as it is just and proper; and when they are twenty-one years old he is to give them a free (new) dress. Still it is our

cordial desire and counsel that if the old negro wench would not like to go away, he (who was her master) should use all diligence to prevent such unchaste life, and lay it before her earnestly, and if she would be free to give her her free papers, etc.
1797 ART 1. It was considered good, and also concluded unanimously, that no brother or sister should have negroes as slaves; and in case a brother or sister had such, he (or she) has to set them free. And in case a person is drawn by the grace of God, who has negroes, and desires to be received into the church, then it is to be laid before him (or her) before being received by baptism into the church, that it is the brotherly and united counsel that brethren and members having negroes for slaves, and thinking that they could not at once emancipate them, may hold them so long as the nearest church may deem that they had earned the money, and then, according to the counsel of the church, to let their slaves go free, with a good suit of wearing apparel (frei kleid) as is given to a white serve. And if they (the slaves) have children, they shall stay with the brother as servants until they are twenty-five years old; he is to have them taught reading and writing, and bring them up in the fear of the Lord, and when they enter upon their (26) twenty-sixth year, to let them go out free with a good suit of clothing (frei kleid). Further it is considered, if a brother, contrary to this conclusion, would purchase negroes, and would not emancipate them, he would have to be considered disobedient, and we could have no fellowship with him until he sets them free.

1812 ART. 5. Concerning the slave trade and slaveholding; it was considered that it is a most grievous evil, and should be abolished as soon as possible.
1813 ART. 1. With regard to the slave trade and slave holding, it was unanimously considered that it is wrong, and that it belongs to the iniquities of Babylon, making merchandise of **souls of men** (Rev. xviii. 13), and that it is carried on by the spirit of this world, and is contrary to the good and holy spirit of God, by whom all the faithful souls dedicated to God are ruled and led into all truth, and are to come out, according to the counsel of God, of Babylon, not touching the unclean thing, that they be not partakers of her sins, and receive not of her plagues. Hence it is unanimously and in union considered, that no member, neither brother nor sister, shall purchase or sell negroes, and keep none for slaves; members should also, with all diligence, restrain their children from it as far as it is possible while they are yet out of the church. Further it was concluded,

if there were members having slaves, or persons who wish to be received into the church and have slaves, that they might hold them in a proper way so long as the church near which they live may deem it necessary for the slaves to earn the money they had cost, and then, with the counsel of the church, they are to be set free, with a good suit of clothing; and if there are any who have not bought, but inherited their negroes, they are to be liberated as soon as the church considers it right and proper. And if members have negro children under their care, or even as slaves, they shall bring them up in an orderly manner, teach them also to read, and keep them, if males, to the age of twenty-one years, and if females, to the age of eighteen years, and then, with the counsel of the church, emancipate them, with a good suit of wearing apparel. Further it has been unanimously concluded, that if members having negro slaves, will not set them free, and thus oppose themselves to the order of God and the loving counsel of the old brethren, who are indeed servants and stewards of God, and even the united counsel of the whole yearly meeting, then after sufficient admondition they would have to be held bound (according to the word). We would have to deny such members the breaking of the bread of communion, the holy kiss, and the brotherly counsel, yet according to the word of the apostle Paul, to admonish them as brethren or sisters.

1837 ART. 10. How is it considered if a brother buys and keeps slaves, and sells them also again? Considered, that it could in no wise be justified in a brother, according to the gospel.

1845 ART. 3. In regard to hiring slaves, it was considered but little better than purchasing and holding slaves, and that it would be best for a follower of Jesus Christ to have nothing to do with slavery.

(Special)
1846 ART. 1. How, and whether a brother can be received who had been expelled from the church for selling and bill-of-saleing away his slaves, and afterward wishes to be received again? Considered, that such a brother can not be reinstated until he has used every exertion in his power to liberate them, and make full satisfaction to the church.

1853 ART. 9. Concerning slavery. How shall any branch of the church proceed, in case an individual wishes to become a member, who is in possession of a slave or slaves, and the law of the state in which they reside is such that they can not manumit them in safety, without transporting them beyond its limits; and as we are aware that the several states where slavery does not exist are contemplating and passing strenuous laws, prohibiting their emigration thither, etc., it seems indispensably necessary for us to adopt some other plan than hitherto practiced, in order that the church should be kept clear from the evils of slavery, and that such persons may be enabled to come into Christ's kingdom? The questions involved were considered too important, and therefore concluded to intrust this matter to a committee, to report thereon as soon as possible, the committee to consist of the following brethren: Joseph Arnold and Benj. Moomaw, of Virginia, John M. Umstad, Sam Lehman, Isaac Price, and David Bosserman, of Pennsylvania, and Daniel P. Sayler, and Henry Koons, of Maryland.

1853 ART. 14. How is it considered for a man, who is a brother, to purchase a man or woman that is a slave, upon condition that such slave shall be free, or emancipated, after serving the purchaser a certain number of years, agreed upon by the slave and his purchaser, without consulting the church? Considered, that no brother should do so without the counsel of the church; and we believe the better way would be to have nothing at all to do with slavery in no shape or form whatever.

1854 ART. 1. Report of the committee appointed last year on the subject of slavery. (See Minutes of 1853, Art. 9.) The question having been, "How shall any branch of the church proceed in case an individual wishes to become a member who is in possession of slaves, and the law of the state in which they live is such that they can not manumit them in safety, without transporting them beyond its limits?"

"Agreeable to the ninth query of Yearly Meeting of 1853, concerning slavery, the committee appointed to report the same have had this subject under serious consideration, in the fear of the Lord, and do report as follows:

"First, Under no circumstances can slavery be admitted into the church.

"Second,In all cases where a holder of a slave or slaves wishes to become a member in the church, he be required to manumit all his slaves before baptism, upon the following conditions: The males to go out free at the age of twenty-one, and the females at the age of eighteen years. All those over and above these ages, when manumitted, are to be paid by their former owner such a sum, either in money or goods, as may be judged right by the church in which the case may occur, and which is considered as the best judge, being acquainted with all the circumstances—as a compensation for their services over age. This will enable the manumitted to migrate to a land of liberty, and will relieve the conscience of the liberator from the burden of taking with him to the bar of God the wages of oppression."

This report was adopted, after a lengthy discussion by the meeting.

1857 ART. 6. As the subject of slavery has often been before the Annual Meeting, and as it has always been considered that no brother can, according to the gospel, hold a fellow-creature in bondage (to which we say, Amen), what, then, is to be done with brethren who do not observe the advice given by the Yearly Meeting, in this or in any other respect? Answer: That such churches or members should be visited, and if not willing to liberate their slaves, they should be dealt with according to the gospel manner of dealing with all gross transgressions.

1862 ART. 15. How is it considered, if a minister defends and justifies slavery, even in a public debate? Answer: It is utterly wrong for any brother to do so, according to Matt. vii. 12.

1863 ART. 5. What should be done with a brother that would preach that slavery was right according to the Scriptures, and cause discord among the brethren? Inasmuch as the brethren always believed, and believe yet, that slavery is a great evil, and contrary to the doctrine of Christ, we consider it utterly wrong for a brother to justify slavery, either in public or in private, and that he should be admonished, and if obstinate, shall be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

1865 ART. 31. Is it right for any of our ministering brethren to entertain pro-slavery principles, and preach them publicly and privately? Answer: It is considered not right, according to Luke vi. 31, and if any brother should persist in doing so he should be dealt with according to Matt. xviii.

Standing Committees

1849 ART. 45. Whether it would not be best, at our Annual Meetings, for the committee to investigate the letters on Saturday, in order that the business might be more readily disposed of on Monday? Considered, that the present arrangement is probably as good as we could adopt.

1853 ART. 1. Whether it would not give more general satisfaction, in the arrangement of the standing committee, to select them, by ballot, out of the whole number of ordained brethren present? Considered, unanimously, to make no change, in this matter, from the ancient and present usage, viz., that the elders of the church, where the Yearly Meeting is held, should have the privilege, as heretofore, to nominate said committee.

1861 ART. 15. Would it not be better, and give more satisfaction to the brotherhood at large, if the brethren serving or composing the standing committee at our Annual Meetings would be changed every year, so as to have at least two-thirds of the same fresh members? Considered, that we do not think it advisable to make any change in the manner of choosing the standing committee, and are still satisfied with the decision of the Yearly Meeting of 1853. (See Article 1, in the minutes of that year.)

1862 ART. 45. Is it in accordance with the gospel for the standing committee of the Yearly Meeting to send a committee into a church, if desired by such that are expelled from the church according to Matt. xviii., the church having no knowledge of it? Answer; No, but the church which has expelled him should call a committee, if the expelled member requests it.

1863 ART. 6. Would it not be expedient and consistent that the brethren forming the standing committee of the Annual Meeting of the brethren should open and examine all questions (sent in by the several churches, and assort them), and thereby save an amount of unnecessary labor and time spent, as there are frequently two, three, and even more, queries of the same import and meaning sent in, and acted upon (separately reported hitherto by different committees) at the same conference, which, we think, could be avoided in a great measure? Considered, it is expedient.

1867 ART. 15. Would not the following be a better way for organizing the Annual Meeting than that which is now practiced? Let each district council select one ordained elder as a member of the standing committee of the Annual Meeting, and should any vacancy or vancancies occur, the elders of the church holding the Annual Meeting shall supply the same from among the ordained elders present at the meeting. Answer: We think it best to lay this question over until next year, with the understanding that the brethren where the next Annual Meeting will be held be instructed to select the standing committee, as much as practicable, according to the foregoing plan.

1867....ART. 19. In the minutes of the Annual Meeting of 1866, it is said that "any member falling under the counsel of the church, and being dissatisfied with the decision, may appeal to the Annual Meeting, by presenting a petition, signed by a number of the members of the church." Would it not be better to reconsider this clause or paragraph, and put it back to the decision of the Annual Meeting of 1849, Art. 26? Answer: We think it not advisable to repeal the paragraph, but that we add what was intended, namely, this: The Annual Meeting shall hear their petition, through the standing committee, and if they deem their claim just, they shall grant them a committee, who shall examine the case, and their decision shall be final.

1868 ART. 6. Would it not be better, and more in accordance with the sentiments of a majority of the brethren, to change our present manner of appointing the standing committee of our Annual Meeting, so that each district-meeting elect some one of the bishops within the district to constitute one of said committee? And would it not also be better to give the committee liberty, after it has elected its moderator, to elect its clerks and other officers from the body of the members present, rather than confine it in its choice to its own members? Answer: We think it would be better so to do.

1868 ART. 22. Is it in accordance with the order of the brethren for the standing committee of the Annual Meeting to appoint elders to preside over a district, without the knowledge or consent of said district? Answer: We think the standing committee has a right, under certain circumstances, to do so.

1871 ART. 15. Would it not render more general satisfaction if churches which have difficulties to settle would, when they fail to settle them, call upon the elders in the adjoining churches to come to their assistance; and if, in case a committee be after that needed, let them apply to their annual district-meeting, instead of our General Conference, for said committee, and let it be selected from the churches which compose said district-meeting, saving much expenses, etc.? Answer: We think it best to make no change in regard to the authority for appointing committees to make a final settlement of difficulties.

1871 ART. 31. Would it not be best to allow all brethren in the second degree of the ministry to represent the churches in Annual Meeting, and sit on the standing committee, if sent by the district-meeeting? Answer: We think it best to make no change.

1872 ART. 13. Whereas, the Annual Meeting of 1866, in organizing district-meetings, says: "The district-meetings shall endeavor to settle all questions of a local character; and, whereas, it is known that questions of such a character have been settled, according to truth and justice, by individual churches, aided by elders called by the church. Yet there are always some members who are dissatisfied, and appeal to the Annual Meeting for committees from abroad, at heavy expenses, etc., which are no more competent of deciding correctly than are the elders in the district in which the cases occur; therefore the district of eastern Maryland petitions the Annual Meeting to authorize the several district-meetings to settle all questions and cases arising among them, not of a doctrinal character. The Annual Meeting postponed this question.

1875 ART. 5. Is it right for the standing committee to change the import of any query addressed to the Annual Meeting? Answer: It is not right to do so.

1875 ART. 14. Whereas, there are many committees called for every year, would it not be advisable for the standing committee of the Annual Meeting to be careful, and not to select too many from their own body, as it might appear to some as if they would like to do all the business themselves? Answer: We advise as Paul does, when he says: "Observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality."

1877 ART. 10. Whereas, we deem fairness honorable in all cases, and feeling aggrieved at the way the question of feet-washing has been treated, we wish to know whether it is right for the Standing Committee to take queries that have been answered by district meetings, and change the answers, and then bring their answers before the meetings and put them on the minutes without being passed by the Annual Meeting? Answer: No; we think not.—This answer was given by the District Meeting. Then when the subject came before Annual Meeting the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That as there is a charge against the Standing Committee, we appoint a committee to ascertain whether the charge is true.

A committee was appointed, and the following is its report, which was accepted and passed by Annual Meeting:

TO THE ANNUAL MEETING:—We, your committee appointed to investigate the above charge against the Standing Committee of last year, would say, that if the charge was sustained against said committee, it would be responsible for transcending its prerogatives; but inasmuch as the action taken, and answer given, was upon a query to which no answer was given by district meeting, we find that the charge is not fully sustained; and, whereas, it is claimed by the complainant that inasmuch as the promise was given by the Standing Committee through its chairman in 1875, that if they would bring their query in proper form to the next Annual Meeting, they should be heard, and then when so brought the committee of 1876 suppressed it with its answer, and put their own answer to a similar query upon the minutes which did not pass the meeting.

In this we find that the query in question, with its answer, was read before the meeting, and also the query which had no answer from the district meeting, with the answer of the Standing Committee, the whole matter was now brought before the meeting and freely discussed in the presence of the representatives of the complainant, whose right it was to have moved the consideration of their petition. The query and answer submitted by the Standing Committee failing to pass, it was decided to defer it. The answer, however, was put upon the minutes, which, in our judgment, was wrong, but for this wrong we find the clerk responsible, and not chargeable to the Standing Committee. B. F. Moomaw, Jacob Berkey, J. W. Brumbaugh.

1877 ART. 22. In view of the assumption of power by the standing Committee of last Annual Meeting, in suppressing the answers to queries sent by district meeting, and giving their own instead thereof, we ask you to enter your protest against such proceedings, and demand that all questions from district meetings, having answers, shall go before the meeting without alteration, and that the Standing Committee frame answers only to such as have no answers to them. Considered, that this meeting concurs in the sentiment of the above petition, and therefore grants the wish of the petitioners. Answer: The Standing Committee did not suppress the answer from the district meeting of Virginia, and they should take the charge back.

1880 ART. 19. We request the Annual Meeting of 1880, through the District Meeting of Northern Illinois, to reconsider Article 6, in minutes of 1868, and change it so as to give the Standing Committee the same liberty in electing its moderator that it has in electing its clerks. Answer: The Annual Meeting grants the change asked for.

1881 ART. 31. Is it right, or according to the gospel and the order of the Brethren, for an elder to get up in annual council, and express himself that there is a number of decisions passed at annual council that he does not regard at all, and then have such a one on the Standing Committee? Answer: It is not right to do so.

1933 ART. 5. How is it considered when Standing Committee brethren, also members called in for testimony go home from Annual Meeting and give out matters to the Brotherhood that had been discussed before the Standing Committee? Will not this Annual Meeting consider the impropriety of such conduct and strongly advise against the same? Answer: We grant the request of the query. Passed.

1934 ART. 2. Inasmuch as we have outlined in the minutes of our Annual Meeting the duties that belong to the Standing Committee (See Minute, Art. 2, 1882, 15th line from top of page, read "It shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to see that all the business is properly brought before the general Council"). Therefore, we kindly ask that the Standing Committee, hereafter adhere to our established order and not assume to render decisions or give advice of a definite form without bringing it before the General Council for decision. Answer: Deferred for one year.

1935 ART. 1. Query No. 2 of the A. M. of 1934 (above) which was deferred for one year was firstconsidered. Answer: Request granted.

1938 ART. 1. The following query was deferred by the A. M. of 1936 and by that of 1937):

We earnestly pray A. M. to carefully consider the necessity of passing and placing upon the minutes, a decision providing that no member, and especially no member of the Standing Committee, to whom has been presented a paper signed by a number of names, whether it be a charge or otherwise, by which it can be seen that the signers have aught against that member (Matt. 5:13-24), can be sent or serve as messenger to Annual Meeting, and that any church knowingly sending such disqualified messenger shall fall into the hands of the Brotherhood.

Answer of the sub-committee of 1936: We agree to grant this request.

Answer: Passed with the answer of 1936.

Sunday

1810 ART. 5. Concerning working on Sundays. Inasmuch as there are some members who are so easily brought to work on Sundays, it has been considered thus, that it should not be by all means, except in cases of necessity, for it is a transgression of the law of God, and that of our rulers.

1817 ART. 7. Concerning working on Sunday, it was concluded that members should do no work on Sunday, except in cases of great necessity, inasmuch as the apostle writes to "give none offense, neither to the Jews, nor to the gentiles, nor to the church of God." I. Cor. x. 32.

1828 ART. 4. Whether we may do labor on Sunday, it was deemed good to refrain from it.

1834 ART. 2. Whether we may work on Sunday, such as sawing (on sawmills), shooting , moving, etc. It was considered, that it should not be by any means, but that we ought to spend the Sunday in stillness, and in the fear of God, in order to be offensive to no one.

1936 ART. 7. Concerning work or moving on Sunday, it was considered improper to do so.

1852 ART. 14. How is it considered, when brethren do any kind of servile work on the Sabbath or Lord's Day? Considered, that brethren should by no means do any servile work on the Christian Sabbath day, nor engage in sporting, such as fishing, hunting, etc. And in case members will do so, they should be visited in the name of the church, and heartily admonished to do so no more, and if they should persist in so doing, they should be dealt with as offenders. (That necessary labors, such as feeding and watering creatures, preparing food for the family, and the like, form an exception, is obvious.)

1863 ART. 28. With regard to the question whether a brother minister was rightly dealt with who has taken the liberty to do servile work on the Lord's day repeatedly, and notwithstanding he has been admonished again and again, continues to defend and pursue his course to the offense of many in and out of the church, it appears that the church, with a chosen committee of elders, has decided that the brother has either to quit this practice, or the exercise of his ministry. The standing committee unanimously confirms this decision.

1864 ART. 15. How are we to hold a brother that keeps Saturday for the Sabbath, works on Sunday, and strongly contends that he is right? Answer: Inasmuch as the old brethren have always observed the first day of the week as a day of rest and public worship, we think such a brother should be heartily admonished to conform to the order of the brethren and the gospel, and if he does not do so, he should be dealt with according to the gospel.

1873 ART. 5. Is it right to gather or boil sugar-water on the Sabbath or Lord's-day? Answer: It is not right to do so.

1876 ART. 16. A brother has a dairy, and objections were made against him for furnishing his customers milk on Sunday, claiming that brethren would do no more harm to work on their farms on Sunday. The brother claims that his customers, many of them, are ministers, and ministers of Sabbatarian churches, who say they must have their milk; besides, he furnishes milk for the sick, and for children raised by the bottle; and he says not to be allowed to furnish the milk would ruin his business, and subject him to heavy loss. What is to be done in the case? Answer: We can not grant a brother liberty to furnish milk on the Sabbath to his customers, only to the sick and to the children, and we advise him to get out of the business as soon as possible.

Schools, (Sabbath or Sunday Schools)

1838 ART. 10. Whether it be right for members to take part in Sunday-schools, class-meetings, and the like? Considered most advisable to take no part in such like things.

1857 ART. 11. How is it considered for brethren to have Sabbath schools, conducted by the brethren? Answer: Inasmuch as we are commanded to bring up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, we know of no scripture which condemns Sabbath-schools, if conducted in gospel order, and if they are made the means of teaching scholars a knowledge of the Scriptures.

1862 ART. 1. Is it agreeable to the order of the brethren to hold Sabbath-schools; and, if so, how should they be conducted? Answer: The decision of the Annual Meeting of 1857 is readopted.

1862 ART. 31. Will the brethren, at Annual Meeting, consider it right to establish Sunday-schools? and if they do consider it right, will they also consider it right for members of the church, and their children, to attend Sunday-school celebrations? Answer: We consider it right to have Sunday-schools, if conducted by brethren, but not to have celebrations.

1868 ART. 14. As the Annual Meeting has given the liberty to hold Sabbath-schools, it is particularly requested that this Annual Meeting give a full and definite answer to the last question in Art. 1, minutes of 1862, that there may be a uniformity of practice among the brethren who hold, or who wish to hold, Sabbath-schools. Answer: We advise that, where the nature of the case will admit of it, for brethren to hold Sabbath-schools, and such schools should be opened by singing and prayer, and closed by singing or by prayer, as it may be thought proper, and they should be superintended by brethren. And we advise the brethren to be very careful in introducing books, to introduce none that inculcate doctrines contrary to the gospel. And we further advise that brethren avoid taking part in or encouraging the Sabbath-school celebrations, common in the world.

1870 ART. 25. Does the Annual Meeting consider it wrong for the brethren to hold their Sunday-schools in their meeting houses? Answer: We consider it not wrong, if such schools are conducted according to order, and by the consent of the church.

1871 ART. 17. Will not this Annual Meeting recall the privilege granted to establish Sunday-schools, especially where the church is not entirely unanimous? Answer: We do not recall the above privilege, but where the establishing of Sunday-schools would cause trouble or division, brethren had better desist from introducing them.

1873 ART. 11. As the Annual Meeting has given the liberty to hold Sabbath-schools, if held according to the gospel, this district-meeting thinks the Annual Meeting should give the order for holding Sabbath-schools. Answer: This query is answered in, or designed to be answered in, the answer of Art. 14, of the minutes of 1868. And in addition to said answer, we would say that our Sabbath-schools should be held, as all our meetings should be held, to the glory of God. (I. Cor. x. 31.) And as the object of our Sabbath-school is to teach children Christianity, Sabbath-school teachers should observe the directions given by Paul to parents, in which he admonishes us to bring up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Eph. vi. 4.

1874 ART. 20. If a church is dissatisfied with members that go to Sunday-school conventions, and pass a decision that members shall not go to such places, and if they do go, that they must make an acknowledgment for the same, can the church enforce such decision without the sanction of the Annual Meeting? Answer: We think it has the power.

1879 ART. 9. Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting has advised brethren to desist from holding Sabbath-schools where it causes trouble—and in some instances a few brethren have prevented even a large majority from holding Sabbath-schools, upon the ground that they would not be reconciled to it, and, therefore, an organization could not be effected without causing much trouble—will the district meeting consent to ask the Annual Meeting to modify this restriction in such a way that a portion of a local church can not prevent us from holding Sabbath-schools according to the direction of the Annual Meeting, provided such schools are held according to gospel order and for the honor and glory of God? This district meeting asks the Annual Meeting not to let a small minority prevent a large majority from organizing Sunday-schools. Answer: We advise the small minority to yield to the majority for the sake of peace And we also would advise the majority to not overrule the minority in a way that shows no regard for their feelings.

1880 ART. 13. Shall the majority of a church, some of whose members say that they would rather their children would fish, hunt, play ball, and other like vain amusements on Sundays, rather than have them go to Sunday-school, prevent other brethren from collecting their children together in their school-house on the Sabbath day to teach them the Scriptures, when such school is conducted in the order of the Annual Meeting? We ask Annual Meeting not to let a majority prevent a minority from meeting at a school-house to teach the Scriptures in the capacity of a Sunday-school. Answer: The request is granted.

1881 ART. 25. As the latter decision of Annual Meeting on the subject of Sabbath-schools has caused trouble and confusion, we ask Annual Meeting to consider all its decisions on this subject since 1871, Article 17, and readopt the decisions of that year. Answer: We adopt the decisions of 1871, Article 17, as the best for the peace of the church; but where there is a large majority, or even a minority, can hold a Sabbath-school without interfering with the peace and union of the church, they may have the privilege of such a school.

(Recon. Min.)

1883 SEC. 2. SUNDAY-SCHOOLS. These, having no explicit scriptural or apostolic authority for precedence, rejected. But as it stands upon the resolutions, "More of human origin than the command of Christ," a custom of this world, HAVE NONE. [See Resolutions.] (Accepted.)

Schools, Singing

1825 ART. 4. Whether a brother may teach singing-schools, was considered, that the musical schools, as they are generally conducted, have nothing to do with the service of God, and that a brother should teach none.

1857 ART. 22. Is it agreeable to the gospel for brethren to teach singing-schools? Answer: We consider it best for brethren not to teach singing-school on the Sabbath or at night.

1862 ART. 7. Is it allowed by the brethren, in Annual Council, for the members of the church to attend singing-schools on Sundays, or at night, or in the week? Answer: While we would caution our members, especially the young, against the abuses of singing-schools, we would not absolutely forbid them, if conducted orderly, and if they do not conflict with the time of preaching.

1874 ART. 9. Is it wrong for brethren to organize a class for singing purposes, and have it taught in their meeting-houses, if it is done in good order? Answer: It is not wrong, if the church is willing.

Schools, Debating, Lyceums

1867 ART. 35. Is it considered expedient for brethren to join debating schools or lyceums? Considered by this meeting that it is not expedient for brethren to do so.

1868 ART. 4. Is it considered expedient for brethren to join debating schools or lyceums? Answer: We think it not expedient for brethren to do so.

1875 ART. 26. Is it consistent with the gospel, and the order of the church, for brethren to take part in the so-called lyceum, debating or declaming society, or for ministering brethren to act as president, and thereby entice other members into the evil? Answer: We think it is unbecoming a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ to do so; and we would, therefore, most eanrestly admonish our brethren to abstain from it. But should any of our brethren persist in taking part in such societies, they should be dealt with as other offenders, according to Matt. xviii. (See Rom. i. 29; I. Cor. xiii. 20; I. Tim. vi. 58; see, also, decisions of Annual Meetings.)

Schools (High Schools and Colleges)

1836 ART. 1. Whether it was considered advisable for a member to have his son educated in college? Considered not advisable, inasmuch as experience has taught that such very seldom will come back afterward to the humble ways of the Lord.

1852 ART. 12. How is it considered by the brethren, if brethren aid and assist in building great houses for high schools, and send their children to the same? Considered, that brethren should be very cautious and not mind high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Rom. xii. 16.

1857 ART. 19. What are the views of the present Annual Council in regard to the contemplated school, that was alluded to, some time since, in the "Gospel Visitor?" Answer: It is conforming to the world. The Apostle Paul says: "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth."

1858 ART. 51. We desire to know whether the Lord has commanded us to have a school besides our common schools, such as the one contemplated in the "Gospel Visitor?" If we are, ought we not to have it soon? And if it is not commanded of the Lord, ought we to have one? And is it right to contend for or against such an institution publicly through the press, since our different views may become a stumbling-block before the world? And if it is once decided, ought we not to keep forever silent about it? Answer: Concerning the school proposed in the "Gospel Visitor," we think we have no right to interfere with an individual enterprise so long as there is no departure from gospel principles.

1861 ART. 2. Is it in harmony with the spirit of the gospel, when brethren teach school, at the expiration of the term, to hold exhibitions, attended with music? Considered, that it is not, and that brethren would better close by singing and prayer. (See James v. 13, and Eph. v. 19.)

1861 ART. 10. How is it considered if brethren suffer their children to take an active part in school debates and exhibitions? Considered, that there can be no objection, if conducted in an orderly manner; and we advise brethren (at the same time not to forget) to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

1862 ART. 16. Inasmuch as the Yearly Meeting has allowed of brethren's children taking an active part in school exhibitions, if properly conducted, is it wrong for brethren to go with them, to investigate such exhibitions? Answer: We consider it best to leave the answer to query 10 of last Yearly Meeting, as it is; and in answer to the additional question whether the parents may go to school exhibitions, we would say we consider it best for them not to go, if their going would be likely to encourage any thing that is of an evil character.

1867 ART. 22. Has Bro. E. Heyser a right, being a ministering brother, to receive pay from the government for teaching school in the South, under the employment and protection of the Freedmen's Bureau? Answer: Inasmuch as Bro. Heyser is employed by the government in teaching school, and not in preaching the gospel, we can see no impropriety in the government paying him for teaching.

1869 ART. 24. Is it according to the gospel for brethren who are school teachers, whether lay members, ministers, or elders at the expiration of their school, to have exhibitions, at which their scholars speak dialogues, and have two or three fiddles to keep up time, and have large crowds assembled together? And if it is wrong, can it be done. And if it is right, please give us Scripture for it, so that all may be satisfied. Answer: We consider such exhibitions very wrong, and think brethren should not encourage them.

1876 ART. 3. Is it agreeable to the gospel and faith, and order of the brethren, to hold the office of school director under the present laws of Pennsylvania? Answer: We think it best for brethren not to serve in such capacity, where a school director, according to the laws of the state, may have to collect school-tax, and imprison a person if he does not pay his tax.

1877 ART. 28. Will not the district meeting ask Annual Meeting to reconsider the third query of last year? Answer: This Annual Meeting decides not to reconsider said query.

(Recon. Min.)

1884 SEC. 26. SCHOOL EXHIBITIONS. The subject of members or their children attending and taking part in school exhibitions, lyceums, and debates, we find that there is more liberty granted than what, in our humble judgment, is in harmony with the duties enjoined upon parents "bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." So we would recommend to advise parents not to go, and also instruct their children not to attend and take part in such proceedings and like kinds of gatherings of the world. (Accepted.)

1916 ART. 2. Inasmuch as there is a difference of opinion in regard to members holding office on boards of public schools, and thereby causing grievance among our dear members, cannot this Annual Meeting give us advice so we may be more of one mind, and in love and union? Answer: Since the public boards of educartion encourage practices in public schools that we feel our brethren cannot encourage or sanction, we, your sub-committee, agree unanimously to advise that brethren do not hold such offices when it can be reasonably avoided. See also Rom. 14. 19; 2 Cor. 6. 14. Passed.

Suspending Members

1858 ART. 12. Is it agreeable to the gospel for a church to grant the privilege to a member to do certain things, and at the same time debar him from the communion for so doing? Answer: That no church, according to the gospel, has a right to do so.

Suspending Ministers

1858 ART. 11. Is it according to the gospel to expel a brother from his office, whether deacon or minister, and yet leave him stand as a member? Answer: We have a right—according to the gospel: inasmuch as he is put into office by the council of the church, by the council of the church the office can be taken from him. I. Tim. iii.

Tavern Keeping

1804 ART. 1. Whether it should or would be allowed to a brother or sister to keep public tavern by or with a license; it was unanimously considered that it could not be allowed, because we are convinced that it can not be done without disorder, and is rather a hindrance to a godly life and quietness of spirit. It has been deemed good in union, that if a brother or sister should undertake to keep tavern, they should be visited in friendship, and in love and seriousness, and in the name of the church be dissuaded and warned from it, and shown unto them what disorder and harm is likely to result thereof. Further it was concluded, that if a brother or sister would not hear, accept, or obey such counsel and admonition, then we would have to consider such as disobedient, and could not have fellowship with them. Yet the sisters, who are bound in such matter by the urging of their husbands, and would gladly be relieved from it, but can not without the consent of their husbands, they should be held less guilty.

1835 ART. 10. How it is considered when brethren keep tavern? Considered, as entirely unbecoming for brethren.

Taxation

1865 ART. 40. Is it contrary to the gospel to raise funds by taxation? Answer: It is not contrary to the gospel to do so.

1867 ART. 33. Art. 40, on the minutes of the Yearly Meeting for 1865, being in relation to raising money by taxation—considered by this district-meeting that the article should be reconsidered by the Yearly Meeting, inasmuch as this district-meeting concluded that it is not contrary to the gospel to raise funds by taxation, provided all the members in the same church are agreed to do so; but a noncompliance should not be a test of fellowship.

1868 ART. 2. The second query asked for a reconsideration of Art. 40, of 1865, being in relation to raising money by taxation. Answer: Though it may not be contrary to the gospel to raise funds by taxation, yet we think it is not expedient to do so. But we do believe that brethren should, in all their contributions to promote benevolence or charitable causes in the church of Christ, contribute, as a general gospel rule, according to what God has blessed them with.

Teaching by Lay Brethren

1836 ART. 3. What is to be done with a brother who professes and claims to be urged by the spirit of God to preach the gospel, and who is not chosen by the church for it? He is counseled and allowed, after the elect brethren have spoken, to make known by exhortation if there is any thing on his mind; he may also use liberty in public prayer, when necessary, or in reading the Scriptures, provided he is acceptable by the church.

1838 ART. 4. Whether a common brother has the right to go out, to appoint or let others appoint meetings for himself, or generally to teach publicly without the counsel of the church? Considered, that a brother who is not intrusted with the office, is not justified so to do. James iii. 1.

1839 ART 3. What is to be done with a brother who wants to preach, and forces him into it without or contrary to the counsel of the church? Considered, that such a brother, having been admonished once and again, can not be held as a member in full fellowship, if he is disobedient.

1845 ART. 7. How it is considered, if brethren will force themselves into the ministry, without consent from the elders, and some of the members encourage them in it? Considered, that inasmuch as it appears by the words of James, chapter iii. 1, by the words of our Savior (John x. 1), and of Paul (Heb. v. 4-7), there is a right way and a wrong way to enter into the ministry—the wrong way being when one is taking this honor unto himself, and the right way, when one is called of God, by the church, which is the body of Christ, and the order of which calling to the ministry is found described in the Acts of the Apostles. Brethren ought to be very cautious when they feel a desire to preach the gospel, that they do not take the wrong way; rather humble than elevate themselves, and be fully assured that if the Lord wants their services, he has all power in heaven and on earth to bring about their calling to it in the right order and in due time; but if such brethren would still go out of the way, appoint and hold meetings, against the counsel of the church, the church would have to hold them as disobedient members, according to Matt. xviii, and members generallyought to be very careful not to encourage and support such brethren in their disorderly proceedings.

1849 ART. 1. How is it considered, if a brother teacher, who is not ordained, makes appointments far and near, without the counsel of the church? Considered, that our younger brethren in the ministry, in all cases, should be careful not to appoint meetings or do any thing that is beyond their calling, and consequently would offend the church, or the older brethren, not only, but God also.

1854 ART. 8. Is it expedient for a laboring brother to give liberty to a private brother to exhort or bear testimony at public worship? Considered, as not advisable, and brethren should be cautious not to offend the church by showing partiality to individual members.

1863 ART. 25. Is it according to Scripture for (any or) each brother of the church to have the privilege to appoint meetings, attend the same, and preach? We think it is not in accordance with the gospel, nor promotive of love and union, but rather a fruitful source of contention, strife, and disunion; therefore, no brother should assume such authority, neither any brother encourage such in their proceedings; and if a brother will preach contrary to the will of the church he can not do it in the name of the church. Approved by this Yearly Meeting.

1863 ART. 26. If brethren, not elected, being endowed with the gift of prophecy, and moved by the Holy Ghost to occupy, with their talents, as their Lord commands, and being called on by the people to preach, have the bishops of the church any authority from the gospel to forbid it, merely because they are not elected, provided he or they preach Jesus to edification, exhortation, and comfort, and their appointments do not conflict with any regular meetings of the church? As the apostle directs the spirit of the prophets to be subject to the prophets

(I. Cor. xiv. 35), and as God is said to be the author of peace, and not of confusion (verse 33), and as the apostle asks the question, "How shall they preach except they be sent?" (Romans x. 15), and as Christ selected, from the number of his disciples, those that he designed to preach the gospel, it appears by the gospel not only proper but necessary that there should be a regular induction of those who are to officiate as ministers into the office of the ministry, and therefore we can not sanction the idea entertained by some, that any brother may go out and appoint meetings for preaching.

Teaching by Sisters

1834 ART. 13. Concerning a sister's preaching. Not approved of; considering such sister being in danger, not only exposing her own state of grace to temptation, but also causing temptations, discord, and disputes among other members.

1859 ART.7. Does the gospel admit of female preaching? and, if it does, shall they not have authority from the church under whose jurisdiction they are? Answer: As Paul recognizes a distinction, in Rom. xii. 6-7, between teaching, ministering, and prophesying, and as he evidently approves of females prophesying (I. Cor. xi. 5), we think that a female can not teach or preach, according to I Cor. xiv. 34; I. Tim. ii. 12 ,in the ordinary acceptation of those terms, yet we can not, under all, forbid them to prophesy.

Telephones

1886 ART. 4. Asking the Yearly Meeting of 1886 to say whether members of the church, under any circumstances, may erect telephones, and if admissable, under what situations can it be tolerated? This deferred indefinitely for more mature consideration.

1903 ART. 3. Is it in accord with the Gospel and the nonconformed principles of our Old Brethren for members to have telephones in their houses, and thereby grieving some of our dear Old Brethren, and destroying union and fellowship among members? Answer: Inasmuch as some of our members have telephones and thereby give offense to some of our dear members, we advise members not to have them. See 1 Cor. 8. 13, and 10, 32, 33.

1904 ART. 4. Inasmuch as a number of queries came up to the Yearly Meeting of 1904 regarding the telephone, which were somewhat different in their requests, so the counsel concluded them all in one answer, as follows: Answer: To the various queries relative to the telephone: We, your several subcommittees, advise that our beloved members use more care and caution in the agitation of the telephone question, and that we hold all former decisions of Yearly Meetings on the telephone questcion as we do decisions of all other questions: as advisory and not mandatory. Passed the general counsel unanimously.

1905 ART. 5. Inasmuch as there were four queries presented to this Yearly Meeting, asking for a reconsideration of the answer of Article 4, of 1904, on the telephone, it was decided to grant their request, and adopt the following answer instead: Answer: We advise that our beloved members use more care and caution in the agitation of the telephone question and that we hold the former decisions of Yearly Meeting (on the telephone question) as we do decisions of many other questions.

1913 ART. 1. Since the telephone question has agitated the minds of our brethren to a perplexing extent, various decisions having been passed by Yearly Meetings upon the subject which are not consistent in their meaning nor possible to be applied in a general sense, and since out of this inconsistency have grown dissentions and discord until necessity demands a reconsideration of the whole question. Therefore, we pray the Yearly Meeting of 1913 to reconsider the former minutes entire upon the telephone making all former decisions without binding force, and in their stead adopt the following: This meeting grants the use of the telephone in the houses of our brethren, but strictly enjoins that they be used with caution and care as becometh our profession; and members who shall abuse this liberty shall be dealt with as transgressors. Answer: We, your sub-committee, into whose hands have been placed three queries which we designate, respectively, as No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3, said queries bearing upon the same subject (the use of the telephone among our members), after prayerful consideration of each, conclude that the object designed to be reached in numbers 2 and 3 is also couched in number 1. Therefore, we decide to grant the requests in query No. 1, and further, we agree that queries numbers 2 and 3 be not placed upon the minutes, but sent back to the churches from whence they came. Passed.

Temperance

1844 ART. 4. How is it considered if a brother or sister signs the pledge of total abstinence? Considered, that inasmuch as our churches have always been testifying against intemperance, and even against the free use, the making and selling of ardent spirits, it is not advisable for members to put their hands to the pledge, or to meddle with the proceeding and excitement of the world on this subject.

1844 ART. 7. Whether it be right for a brother to deliver a lecture on temperance, if requested? Considered, as our commission is to preach the gospel, that we should do so, and inculcate temperance as well as other virtues; but to hold lectures on the subject of temperance exclusively was considered not advisable for a brother.

1867 ART. 13. Inasmuch as the church of the brethren has always endeavored to maintain the principle of temperance, will the brethren composing this Annual Meeting admit that members may join a temperance society, in the present form such societies take, outside of the church? Answer: As our brotherhood has, again and again, taken decided ground against intoxicating drinks as a beverage and recommended to the brethren to abstain from their use as such, we see no necessity of joining ourselves to any other organization; and, therefore, we can not allow brethren the privilege of doing so, but renew our solemn protestation against the use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage, and consider it the duty of every member of the church to use his influence against them.

Tents

1908 ART. 7. Two queries (one from the Willow Springs Church, Douglas County, Kansas, and one from the Cedar Creek Church, Anderson County, Kansas), and a petition from the committee of arrangements were presented to this Yearly Meeting asking that canvas tents be purchased by the brotherhood to be used for holding Yearly Meeting, to be properly kept and cared for and shipped to points where the conference may be located. Answer: This Yearly Meeting agrees and decides to buy two canvas tents, size of those used at this meeting, of 10-ounce or 12-ounce ducking and to appoint five brethren to whom shall be entrusted the purchasing, caring for, and shipping of same, for the brotherhood. The following brethren are appointed a committee to attend to this business, viz: J. D. Mohler, I. P. Stitely, Moses Plunkett, Henry Balsbaugh, Frank Petry.

1909 ART. 7. We, the undersigned committee appointed by the Yearly Meeting of 1908, to purchase tents for the purpose of holding Yearly Meetings in, make the following report to the Yearly Meeting of 1909: The committee met for consultation November the 14th, 1908, at the home of Brother Frank Petry, the committee all being present except Brother J. H. Balsbaugh, he being sick at the time and not being able to come. After full consideration of all bids given by the different tent manufacturers, we agreed to place our order for the tents with the Jones Hardware Co., of Richmond, Indiana, for the tents at their price, which is $950, F. O. B. Toledo, Ohio.

The committee not being instructed how to raise the funds with which to pay for the tents, we agreed to solicit the whole brotherhood. By this plan we received the amount that will be reported in the treasurer's report. We, your committee, propose to build or purchase two trucks, with suitable boxes in which to store the tents for shipment and preservation, which will probably cost about $75.00 each.

Report of Treasurer to Yearly Meeting of 1909

We, the tent committee, have appropriated $1,400.00 to the General Brotherhood for purchasing Yearly Meeting tents and caring for same, with other expense, as may be needed.

Appropriations to be raised by Eastern districts		$200.00	
Raised and paid in			$145.40
Yet unraised	$54.60		
For Ohio		525.00	
Raised and paid in			535.25
For Indiana		475.00	
Raised and paid in			254.80
Yet unraised	220.20		
For Western District		200.00	
Raised and paid in			210.30
Total amount paid in			$1145.75
Paid out for tents		950.00	
Paid for traveling expenses and postage		183.62	
Total paid out		$1133.62	
Balance on hand			12.13
Appropriation not yet raised	274.80		

Signed by order of committee.

FRANK PETRY, Treasurer.

1909 We, your tent committee, suggest that the tents be cared for in the locality where the meeting is held, until the next meeting is located, then the tents can be shipped to where the next meeting is to be held. We may be able to have a proper storage for them by that time.

And further, we think some of the small articles that are used each year at the meeting, such as water spigots, etc., should be held by the brotherhood and shipped from place to place with the tent fixtures. Isaac P. Stitely, J. D. Mohler, Moses Plunkett, Frank Petry.

We, the standing committee, agree to accept the tent committee's report, and forward same to this Yearly Meeting for their consideration; and in view of Brother Henry Balsbaugh's affliction, on account of which he asks to be relieved, suggest that his request be complied with and another be appointed in his stead, and this standing committee suggests that D. D. Skiles, of Indiana, be appointed in his stead.

The Yearly Meeting accepts tent committee's report, with this understanding, that should there be any dissatisfaction in the appropriation made by the committee, it be arranged with the dissatisfied, if any.

1922 ART. 4. Inasmuch as the shipping of our A. M. tents is more expensive on some districts than on others, we ask this A. M. to decide that the tent committee ship the tents where they are to go and the Brotherhood bear the expense of shipping, the same as of keeping them in repair. Answer: Request granted. Passed.

1931 ART. 7. Inasmuch as there exists a difference of opinion in the Brotherhood as to whether or not the expense of renting the tents for the A. M. which was held in California in 1930, shall be paid out of the treasury of the tent funds (owing to the impression that has gone out over the Brotherhood by some promises being made when the meeting was located in the far west, saying that the Brotherhood would not be burdened with said expense) there is now some controversy existing amongst members, some saying it would not be treating the Western District fair by soliciting them for funds to cover the expense for a new tent and also to let them bear their own expense in renting the tents for said A. M. And now as you will notice in this year's report of the Tent Committee, the Western District has not been solicited.

Therefore, we, your Tent Committee, with the counsel of some elders of the Standing Committee, have decided to submit the matter to this A. M. for consideration.

From the Tent Committee
Ezra Denlinger, D. D. Skiles, D. F. Denlinger.

Answer: We decide that the Western District shall be assessed pro rata, the same as the other three districts, for funds for the tent expenses, less the amount that they paid last year for rent of the tents used. Passed.

Testimony of Members

1848 ART. 22. Whether a member, agreeably to gospel, can withhold testimony against his or her matrimonial companion, when such testimony is required. Considered, that such testimony should not be withheld, according to gospel, in a case where it is absolutely necessary (for example, to the conviction and salvation of a fallen member.)

1853 ART. 22. In case a brother would be seen in a trespass against the gospel by one brother, at one day, and in a similar one by another brother the next day, and again in a like trespass by a third brother at another time, whether these three witnesses are sufficient to establish the trespass? Considered, that the testimony is sufficient to convict the brother, and that he should be dealt with according to the gospel.

1853 ART. 37. As regards testimony between members, where two of the brethren's children testify in the same case, but contradict each other; the one brother's child being a member, the other not, but of good moral character. Considered, that all other things being equal, we take the testimony of a brother or member.

Testimony of Outsiders

1817 ART. 4. Whether testimony against a member may be received from outsiders (persons not members), in case of a crime being laid to the charge of a member? Considered, that we could not pass judgment on a member upon testimony from outsiders; but in case one single member could testify with truthful outsiders, then we could and might judge according to the word of God for **"in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established."**

1837 ART 2. How is it viewed, if a member is accused of a crime only on testimony from out of the church? Whether it would be right to take a member into judgment (before the church) on such a testimony? This counsel is to make strict investigation, and if there should be nothing found, and the member continued to deny the charge, it could not be judged on testimony out of the church alone.

1841 ART. 6. Whether members may be brought before the council of the church, and be judged for a crime only on testimony from without—i. e., from persons that are not members of the church? Considered, that when there is some report abroad of a brother walking disorderly, or having committed a crime, it is the duty of the church to send some brethren to the place where the report has originated, to investigate the matter. If nothing be found establishing the charge, and the member denying the same after a close examination, nothing more can be done. If there should, however, some suspicion be created in the members by the general conduct of the accused, the church may advise such a member not to approach the Lord's table until the matter is cleared up to the satisfaction of the church. But to disown entirely a member on testimony only from without, was not considered right and just according to the gospel.

1845 ART. 9. How it is considered, if brethren are accused by the mouth of two or three witnesses, of honest moral character, but not being members, and their testimony against those members agrees, that they were guilty of drunkenness, or any other crime, and the church has cause to believe such testimony, from other circumstances, but the brethren so accused, deny the charge? Considered, as in the year 1841, Art. 6, that such members might be advised not to approach the Lord's table until the matter is cleared up to the satisfaction of the church; but to judge a brother on testimony from without alone, and without his own confession, would not be just, according to the gospel.

1853 ART. 31. Can a brother be judged by testimony from without the church, if he denies the charge? Considered, that he can not. (See Minutes of 1837, Art. 2).

1862 ART. 5. In case a complaint is found against a brother because he was sued in court for an honest debt, and then took the stay, and when he is visited he denies the charge, and says that he was not sued; but the brethren, having evidence to the contrary, agree to send two brethren to the county clerk's office, and the clerk shows, by his record, that the brother was sued, and took the stay for nearly six months, and then paid the debt, together with the costs. Now, the question is, which is to be taken as truth, the brother's word, or the record in the clerk's office? And have the brethren a right, or have they not, to send brethren to the world to investigate church matters? Answer: It is not wrong for brethren to have such matters closely investigated, and to obtain all the light possible.

1862 ART. 57. Can a member, who is accused of some fault, give testimony before the church? Answer: While a person is a member of the church his testimony can not be altogether set at naught by the church.

1865 ART. 35. Would it not be advisable, in case of an evil report against a member, to take the evidence of persons without the church, if considered by the church as persons of truth, to test the matter, if such evidence be carefully handled? Answer: Yes, for the purpose of testing the truth of the report; but an action or condemnation without an acknowledgment of the accused, or without the evidence of members, would not be proper.

1869 ART. 23. Should not the query and answer of Art. 35, of 1865, be repealed? said query relating to outside testimony? Answer: We think the decisions of former years go as far as we can go in taking outside testimony in trying members of the church.

1871 ART. 11. Is it according to the gospel, and the order of the brethren, in case a member wishes outside testimony to prove his position in a matter of difference between members of the church, to have said testimony qualified by an oath or affirmation? Answer: We consider it not according to the gospel for members to require outside evidence under oath or affirmation.

Thanksgiving

1865 ART. 21. Is it according to the order of the brethren, and the spirit of the gospel, for the brethren to order and obey those proclamations made by the President of the United States, and the governors of the states, recommending the observance of certain days, such as Thanksgiving days? Answer: Yes, if such proclamations do not conflict with the spirit of the gospel.

Theaters (See Fairs and Shows)

Territory, Buying, Right to Sell in (See Agents)

Tobacco

1817 ART. 1. Concerning the use of tobacco, it was in union considered, that if a member should be contaminated with it, such should be admonished to quit it; and if it would not be told, such a member could not be elected to any office in the church.

1822 ART. 7. Concerning the abuse of tobacco. This has been before the meeting already before this, and was always considered a shamefully bad habit **(German, Untugend)**—and every thing bad, says the apostle, is sin, and sin defileth the body,; and another apostle says, that your bodies, together with soul and spirit, shall be holy.

1827 ART. 12. Concerning members who engage in the raising of tobacco? Considered, that members should have nothing to do with such things, by which so much mischief is done, and so many men (and women too) are led captive, as is the case with tobacco.

1839 ART. 5. Whether a brother may be intemperate with strong drink or tobacco? No.

1864 ART. 19. Inasmuch as all that our Annual Meeting has hitherto done to suppress the excessive or intemperate use of tobacco, in smoking and chewing, has virtually proved a failure, could not this meeting adopt some method by which the excessive use of this growing evil could be suppressed in our brotherhood? Answer: As the use of tobacco is offensive to some brethren and sisters, and the excessive use of it an evil, we advise and counsel brethren not to use it in time of worship, so as to be either filthy or offensive to others, and we think our ministering brethren should admonish their members not to indulge in the excessive use of it in any way because it is wrong to do so.

1870 ART. 20. Since the Annual Meeting has, at different times, decided against the excessive use of tobacco (See Minutes of 1864, Art. 19), but the object desired has not yet been realized, we therefore ask this district-meeting to suppress its use altogether, except for medical or mechanical purposes, and to deal with such as use it according to Matt. xviii, as we consider it proper to deal with members for wearing fashionable garments. Minutes of 1863, Art. 3, and Minutes of 1866, Art. 27. The district-meeting favored the request, and sent it to the Annual Meeting. Answer: This Annual Meeting renews its disapprobation of the use of tobacco, and especially at the time and in the place of divine worship, and believes it should be classed with other vain and useless things.

1872 ART. 2. A request to reconsider Art. 20, of Annual Meeting of 1870. There was a reconsideration of the article referred to, and the answer of 1870 was renewed, and ordered to be put on the present minutes. It is as follows: "This Annual Meeting renews its disapprobation of the use of tobacco, and especially at the time, and in the place, of divine worship, and believes it should be classed with other vain and useless things."

1880 ART. 16. Is it according to the gospel for a brother who indulges in the filthy fashion of the world in the use of tobacco—except for medicinal purposes—to reprove a sister who indulges in the vain fashions of the world in dress? Answer: No; both fashions being wrong. (See Rom. ii. 1, 3, 21, 22, and Matt. vii. 3-5.)

1881 ART. 14. Inasmuch as the use of tobacco is offensive to the majority of the followers of Christ, and it seems that the Scriptures, indirectly if not directly, forbid its use, we petition district meeting to petition Annual Meeting that hereafter the offices of preacher, deacon, or any other office in the church be given to no one unless he will abstain from its use, except for medical purposes. Answer: We re-affirm the old decisions of 1817 and 1827, and advise all the officers of the church to abstain from its use.

Concerning the use of tobacco, it was in union considered, that if a member should be contaminated with it, such should be admonished to quit it; and if it would not be told, such a member could not be elected to any office in the church. Article 1, Minutes of 1817.

Concerning members who engage in the raising of tobacco. Considered, that members should have nothing to do with such things by which so much mischief is done, and so many men (and women too) are led captive, as is with the case of tobacco. Article 12, of Minutes of 1827.

(Recon. Min.)

1883 SEC. 12. TOBACCO CULTURE AND USING. All the minutes good as could be expected. Our fathers gave us good advice. These minutes do not foster or encourage the desire of either. All retained. The committee recommended to this meeting to advise all our dear members to quit raising or using after the manner of the world. (Accepted).

1897 ART. 4. Inasmuch as there are still sincere convictions among, at least, some of us, according to the gospel and the minutes in regard to the tobacco question, in relation to the use of tobacco as a habit, and in view of these sincere convictions, we ask this Yearly Meeting to define and condense more clearly all the minutes on that question in a revised form, so as to be clearly understood, by which all the means may be unitedly executed against this matter everywhere in our brotherhood, and to make it the duty of all the elders and ministers to faithfully admonish and advise against its use as a habit. Answer: Inasmuch as our fathers have given us good advice, and all former minutes on this question have been retained by the revising committee, we can but insist that their advice be more strictly adhered to.

1930 ART. 2. It being evident that the use of tobacco is on the increase in the world, even many of the dear daughters of our land adopting the practice, and according to our daily observation we fear it is gaining ground in our families, and even in the church, even though many of our dear members continue to hand in loving admonition against it. In view of the alarming condition we tenderly and prayerfully ask this Annual Meeting to reconsider the tobacco question and ask for a minute that hereafter a brother shall not be called to serve in any official capacity in the church who uses tobacco in any form except for medical purposes. Answer: Deferred for one year.

1931 This A. M. of 1931 decides to adopt the answer to the above query proposed last year by the sub-committee, which is as follows:

"We cannot grant the request in this paper except with reference made to the growing tendency of the tobacco habit, and advise to more strongly admonish against its use, in accordance with former decisions. Passed.

Resolutions

1842 ART. 12. Whether a church has the right to make resolutions, framed by men, binding on its members? Considered by the elders, and answered thus: If the resolutions are founded upon and in accordance with the gospel to which we are all bound, they are binding; but if they are not according and even contrary to the gospel, we can not be bound to observe them, and no church can make them binding.

Traditions

1870 ART. 18. How is it considered for members to argue that the old order of the brethren, in wearing a plain garment, is the tradition of men, and say there is no scripture for such order? Answer? We consider it wrong for members to do so, and if they persist in such a course they should be admonished. (See I. Peter v. 5; I John ii. 16.)

Trafficking or Trading

1856 ART. 17. How far may brethren go in trading or trafficking without transgressing the limits of the gospel, and what is to be done with brethren who will not comply with the counsel of the church in such cases? Regarding the first point, considered dangerous, and brethren should not engage in it; as to the latter point, see Matt. xviii. 17.

1866 ART. 39. Is it allowed for brethren, and especially preachers or deacons, to travel through the country, trafficking in fruit-trees, and, their anxiety to sell, use great efforts to sell at extravagant prices, making it quite a speculative business to themselves and to their employers? Answer: We consider it wrong, according to Matt. vii. 12, and brethren who deal in trees should deal honestly, as they should in all their dealings.

1868 ART. 17. Inasmuch as the Annual Meeting has decided that brethren may engage in merchandizing, with no other restriction than that they are not to sell intoxicating liquors should any other restrictions be added, and if so, what are they? Answer: We think it best to refer this question back to the district meeting from which it came.

Vindicator, The

(See Publications, 1882, Art. 3.)

1890 It was submitted and approved of by the Yearly Meeting of 1890, that Henry and John Garber continue the publishing of the Vindicator, the death of Joseph I. Cover occurring since last Yearly Meeting.

1894 To the Brethren Assembled in Annual Council, Greeting:

Inasmuch as the Vindicator counsel, or staff, lost a worthy member and elder, we feel the need of help more than ever, and we ask this Yearly Meeting to add three more elders to said counsel, or staff, and said counsel to be empowered to fill vacancies, change editors, and take full charge of the work to the best interest of the cause of Christ and the church, subject to Annual Meetings. And we further suggest that Brethren William Cassell, J. M. Mohler, and Aaron Frantz be added. Samuel Murray, Henry Garber, John Garber, David Cripe. Passed.

1907 ART. 2. We, the half of the present Vindicator committee, who asked for relief last year, are well aware that the present Vindicator Committee is not giving general satisfaction; and for relief we recommend and ask for an entire new committee, and as past experience has taught us that for convenience those brethren should not live too far apart.

We therefore submit the above to your wise judgment, to grant the request, to amend, to pass upon or to answer and bring before the General Counsel.

William Cassell, Aaron Frantz.

Answer: This standing committee advises the Vindicator Staff to proceed as originated in Annual Meeting of 1882, Article 3, also as approved by Annual Meeting of 1890, and to do as advised and empowered by Annual Meeting of 1894 subjecting same to Annual Meeting for approval after all important changes such as filling vacancies, changing editors, etc. Approved by the Yearly Meeting.

Visiting Applicants for Baptism

1840 ART. 5. How is it considered about the visiting of such persons who apply for baptism; whether they must be visited in all cases before baptism? Considered, that this is a good practice, and that every where if possible it ought to be introduced and observed, without making any limits in certain cases to make an exception; and where this practice is yet unknown, it would be proper to inform the members thereof, and through them those that wish to be received by baptism.

Visiting of Members Yearly

1850 ART. 43. Why is it, that on our yearly visits, we ask the husband of a sister, who himself is not a member of the church, if he knows any thing against any member; yet we are not to receive his evidence in council against a member? Considered, that it is true, what Paul says, "What have I to do with those out of the church?" yet this does not prevent us from that which is no more than an act of courtesy toward the husband of a beloved sister in the Lord. (See Phil. iv. 8.)

1858 ART. 4. Is it according to the gospel of Christ in paying our annual visit, to collect from twenty to thirty of the brethren together in one place, and then the bishops pay the visit to them openly when they are all together, and then send them out two or three together and visit those that were not thus collected?

Or, is it the duty restricted to the visiting brethren exclusively, and should the visit be made from house to house? Answer: As we have no direct rule in the gospel for making the visit, we think it best for visiting brethren to go from house to house.

1866 ART. 22. Whose duty is it to perform the annual church visit? The visiting brethren's duty alone, or is it also a duty enjoined upon the speakers to help to perform it? Answer: We consider it is the deacon's duty to perform the yearly visit, by order of the church, as it belongs to their commission; yet, if speakers see proper to assist them, they can do so.

1867 ART. 2. Would it not be well to have the same questions asked throughout the brotherhood, on our annual visits? Answer: We think it would, and the following form of questions is given: 1. Are you still in the faith of the gospel, as you declared in your baptism? 2. Are you, as far as you know, in peace and union with the church? 3. Will you still labor with the brethren for an increase of holiness, both in yourself and others? 4. Liberty should be given to members to bring any thing they may desire to, and that they may think the good of the church requires, before the visiting brethren.

1868 ART. 13. Would it not promote the profit and edification of the annual meeting visit to the members of the churches to have a season of devotion, consisting of prayer and such other exercises as those who make the visit may feel at liberty to perform, in each family, when the circumstances will admit of it? Answer: We think it would promote the edification of the members of the church to do so, and that when convenient it ought to be done.

1877 ART. 6. As there is not a uniform practice among the churches, since some send a visit to all the members before every communion, while others send only an annual visit, which is the nearest the gospel and for the good of the church? Deferred.

(Recon. Min.)
1884 SEC. 43. YEARLY VISITS. We find the form given [see Article 2, 1867], is not in full harmony with the usages of our faithful brethren. We would recommend the words, **"Conform to the order of the church,"** which our forefathers of the church did commit unto us as the best, namely: Question 1. "Are you, dear brother (or sister, as the case may be), of the same mind as when you were received into the church by your baptism?" Q. 2. "Are you still willing to receive and give

counsel according to the gospel order?" Q. 3. "Are you, as far as you know, in peace and union with the church?" Q. 4. (Remarks if any to make.) There is now liberty, dear brother (or sister, as the case may be), given to you should you see or have any knowledge of anything among your dear members which would be out of order, and contrary to sound doctrine (if let go on so), now is your time to make it known. Otherwise say nothing, nor should anything be accepted by the visiting brethren which is or would be of a personal nature, until Matthew xviii. has been fully carried out and complied with. And, further, that the visiting brethren do not neglect their duty in admonishing the members and their children to their duties—to attend the meetings, to read the Scriptures, etc.—more especially when requested to do so, their devotions should be attended with singing and prayer. (Accepted.)

1912 ART. 4. As there is not a uniform practice among the churches in serving the yearly church visit, some sending the visit to all the members one or two weeks prior to the communion, and others from three to five months prior thereto, would it not be more in accordance with the Gospel and for the good of the churches to have one order of time in which to send the church visit? Answer: We, your sub-committee, decide that in our judgment, according to the general order of the church, it is best not to have the yearly visit too long before the communion, but have it as near as circumstances will admit. Passed by the meeting.

Visiting Churches

1851 ART. 18. Would it not be advisable for the brethren, assembled in Annual Meeting, to establish certain well-established, ordained elders, and send them, two by two, to visit certain districts appointed to them, etc.? The decision to lay over till next year.

1852 ART. 7. With regard to sending traveling brethren, according to Art. 18 of last year's minutes, it was concluded, that every church, and even members, have the privilege to call on the Yearly Meeting, or otherwise, for brethren to visit them.

Warfare

1790 ART. 2. At a (large and) numerous meeting of brethren on the Schuylkill, at (the place of) Bro. John Bach, May 22, 1790, the following was unanimously concluded by the brethren, viz. We wish and desire that the dear brother, V. P., would desist from his strange notion, because he has renounced with us before God, angels, and men every thing which is contrary to wholesome doctrine, and we believe and profess that Christ has prohibited to his followers the swearing of oaths and the partaking of war. Hence we must hold fast to His truth and word, and withdraw ourselves from every such brother who will justify swearing of oaths and warfare. It is impossible for us to break the bread of communion with such a brother, even if he would allege that the powers that be require us to do so. For our rulers could not do it, if they would, because we must obey God more than men. But now, thanks be to God, we have such a government that will not require of us such contrary to (the dictates of) our conscience. But if there should be some one among us that had such a conscience, that he could fight and swear oaths, such a one would not be of us.

Likewise, we could not break the bread of communion with a ministering brother who would, contrary to our views, baptize backward.

Voice of Church, Taking Private

1934 ART. 4. Inasmuch as there is a difference of practice in our local congregations in taking a private voice of the church, in some districts the Elder or Elders in charge give their voice and remain in the private room, while in other districts they (the Elder or Elders) give their voice and leave the room. And as there is a difference of opinion and dissatisfaction, some thinking that they should stay in the private room while others think they should be out after giving their voice:

We therefore pray the Annual Meeting of 1934 to adopt the following: When a private voice is taken of the members of a local congregation the members of that congregation should go into the private room one by one, and give their voice to the elders or officials of other congregations, and then leave the room after their expression is given. See 1 Tim. 5:21. Answer: Deferred for one year.

1935 ART. 2. Query No. 4 of the A. M. of 1934 which was deferred for one year was reconsidered. Said query reads as follows:

Inasmuch as there is a difference of practice in our local congregations in taking a private voice of the church, in some districts the Elder or Elders in charge give their voice and remain in the private room, while in other districts they (the Elder or Elders) give their voice and leave the room. And as there is a difference of opinion and dissatisfaction, some thinking that they should stay in the private room while others think they should be out after giving their voice:

We therefore pray the Annual Meeting of 1934 to adopt the following: When a private voice is taken of the members of a local congregation the members of that congregation should go into the private room one by one, and give their voice to the elders or officials of other congregations, and then leave the room after their expression is given. See 1 Tim. 5:21.

Answer: Passed with the answer of the 1934 sub-committee which is:

This committee feels to grant the request herein asked for, with this amendment, that said Elder or Elders be informed of the result of the private council before it comes to the open council.

1938 ART. 6. Inasmuch as we have no decisions upon what shall be done with the Tally Sheet, after a private voice is taken of the members of a local district: Some give it to the elder in charge, and other elders of the home district see how the voice stood. Then, in other districts, when a private voice is taken, the ones receiving the voice, burn up the Tally Sheet, and only an announcement is made of the decision, like is done by the receiving committee after the voice of the messengers is given for the standing committee at Annual Meeting. Which is the proper way? Answer: We advise to burn all tally sheets. Passed.

Wine at Communion

1858 ART. 36. Is it right to use, at our communion meetings, the article of wine frequently used, and known by those who are the judges of the article to be an adulterated article, and hence can not properly be called the fruit of the vine? Considered, that it is advisable to procure the purest article.

1875 ART. 3. Is it considered according to the gospel for a church, at communion, to use the unfermented juice of grapes in place of wine? Answer: We think it may be left optional to a church to do so, if the members are agreed.

1876 ART. 14. As we consider that the grape juice is not wine until after fermentation has taken place, will not this district-meeting ask the Annual Meeting to repeal the wine question of last year, and decide that only the fermented juice of the grape shall be used on communion occasions, as has always been the practice of the church? Answer: We decide that no change shall be made from the last decision.

(Recon. Min.)

1883 SEC. 13. WINE AT COMMUNION. We retain all decisions of former years, as the fathers understood it. Simply wine. [See minutes of 1858, Art. 36]. All others since disapproved. (Accepted.)

Wives of Ministers and Deacons

1862 ART. 36. Is the practice good and sustained in the gospel for the church enjoining on the believing wives of teachers the duty of aiding, by their humble example and chaste conversation, their husbands in the solemn duty laid upon them? Answer: We consider such a practice in perfect harmony with the spirit of the gospel.

1862 ART. 37. Why are not the sisters, who become wives of ministers after they are appointed to the ministry, called upon in the church to promise the same duties as the sisters who are wives at the time their husbands are appointed to the office? Answer: We consider they should be, according to the practice of the church touching those who are wives of brethren when the latter are appointed to office.

1900 ART. 4. If a sister has been an elder's wife and has been received to the full office, and she then being left a widow and afterwards marries a brother only a lay member, can she still hold her office, or shall she be put back with her present husband. As there has been a difference of opinion among some of the members, can this Annual Meeting give a Scriptural answer? Answer: Let her hold her office, as with her former husband, as we know of no Scripture justifying the church in depriving a sister of an office without charge of crime laid against her. 1 Cor. 7. 39.

1901 ART. 4. If an official brother marries a sister in the laity, and she is to be put in office with her husband, should the elders present have the work done without counseling the church, or should the church be counseled in the matter? As it has been done both ways, to the dissatisfaction of brethren, we ask the Annual Meeting of 1901 to set forth one order, that we may work together in union. Answer: We think that all such work should be done by the counsel of the church, instead of by the elders alone; for the power is in the church, according to the gospel. See Matt. 16. 18, 19; also Article 9, 1849. (See Bishops or Elders.)

PART II

Petitions, Propositions and Statements To Annual Meeting

1869 ART. 1. Whereas, there have been certain petitions from southern Ohio presented to this Annual Meeting, and which have been extensively circulated through the brotherhood, wherein the petitioners have set forth certain grievances, and desire some change or modification in holding the Annual Meeting, and, also, in certain practices among the brethren; and, whereas, this Annual Meeting desires to maintain all the practices and ordinances of Christianity in their simplicity and purity, and to promote the "unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace;" therefore, though it can not grant the changes and objects desired by the petitioners to the full extent petitioned for, it will make the following changes in the manner of holding the Annual Meeting, and endeavor to guard, with increased vigilance, against the abuse of the practices referred to in the supplement, by advising and urging the brethren to observe the cautions and directions in reference to said practices, as hereinafter stated: 1. In relation to the appointing of the standing committee, we advise that the district-meetings select old, experienced, and established brethren; and that in signing the minutes we advise that a suitable number of elders sign them, but not as members of the standing committee, and the signers need not be confined to the committee. We also advise that the minutes be read to all at the close of the meeting, provided there is time, and it be found practicable to do so, and that the term "moderator," as applied to the brother who keeps order, be dropped. 2. In relation to holding protracted meetings for worship, we feel much impressed with the propriety of conducting said meetings in strict accordance with the gospel; that all disorder and improper excitement should be avoided; that care should be taken that the understanding be enlightened, as well as the passions awakened; that on all occasions, when candidates for church membership are visited and examined, they be dealt with as the gospel seems to require, and as the order of the brethren has sanctioned; that in noticing the success of preaching, we advise that the number of additions to the churches be omitted. 3. In relation to Sabbath-schools, we feel the great necessity of guarding against the prevailing manner in which these schools are conducted; of cautioning the brethren who take any part in them against having festivals, or any thing of the kind that does not comport with the spirit of Christianity, which such schools are designed to promote; that care to be taken lest pride be taught rather than humility, and that nothing be encouraged thereby that will conflict with the established order and character of the brethren, and that care should be taken that no offense be given to the brethren in these things. 4. In reference to the controversial articles published in our religious papers, we counsel and advise our brethren Quinter and Kurtz, and H. R. Holsinger, to publish nothing in their periodicals that disputes the practice of the precepts and ordinances of the gospel, as handed down to us from Christ and the apostles, through and by the forefathers of the church; and that Brethren Nead, Kinsey, and all the brethren who write, be cautioned upon this head, and are hereby given to understand that a disregard to this counsel will subject a brother to the counsel of the church. 5. In reference to prayer-meetings, social meetings, and Bible classes, we would say, that we advise the brethren to be very careful in conducting such meetings, when they have been introduced, and to conduct them not after the prevailing custom of the religious world, but in the order that the brethren conduct their meetings for worship; that brethren be cautioned against introducing such meetings where their introduction would cause confusion or trouble in the churches, and that elders always be counseled in introducing such meetings.

1880 ART. 23. The following petition came to Annual Meeting from the District of Southern Ohio:

DEAR BRETHREN:—We do hereby most earnestly petition the Annual Meeting, through the district meeting, to consider the present condition of the church in her confused and divided state, and to make an effort by which may be removed the "Fast Element" from among us, which is the cause of the troubles and divisions in the church.

Now, as all former efforts have failed,—in sending query after query to the Annual Meeting, the exercising of patience and forbearance from time to time, all of which have accomplished but little, the so-called fast element gaining ground year after year, and one innovation after another being introduced among us, which, if suffered to continue, will lead the church off into pride and the popular customs of the world and the other denominations,—we think we feel the propriety of a renewed effort on our part to accomplish the object of this petition.

We in southern Ohio have, of late years, felt and observed the element more than ever, and in serious meditation have we felt the weight of Paul's language in I. Corinthians i. 10, and in I. Peter v. 12. We, as elders of the church over which the Holy Ghost, we trust, has made us overseers, do feel that duty demands of us to make this effort, that we may have order, peace and union again restored among us. We offer the following as the remedy, in our wisdom and judgment, whereby a union can be affected, namely, to hold and maintain the ancient and apostolic order of the church in her humility, simplicity, and nonconformity to the world. And we feel that we can no longer suffer or tolerate those innovations in the church of Christ. The **causes** of the troubles must be removed before peace and union can be restored; and among some of these causes are the high schools among us, popular Sunday schools, with their conventions and celebrations, long protracted meetings, and the way they are generally conducted, by singing revival hymns and giving invitations to rise or come forward; a salaried minister, and the single mode of feet-washing.

Now the things here named we do not regard as being in harmony with the spirit of the gospel, neither are they in harmony with the ancient and apostolic order of the church; and when we speak of the ancient order of our church, we have reference also to non-conformity to the world, not only in dress, but in the building and fancy painting of our houses, barns, etc., after the custom of the world, and gaudy and costly finish put on them, and fine furniture, etc., to set off our rooms and parlors, after the fashions of the world, together with fine and costly carriages, etc. In these things we confess that southern Ohio has gone too far out of the way, and we hope will be willing to reform and make any sacrifice for Jesus' sake.

1. With regard to high schools among us, we fear they will greatly operate against the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, as well as create or cultivate the desire for an educated ministry, which is not in harmony with the teachings of Christ and the apostles, nor with the ancient views of the church. Paul says, "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth." (I. Cor. viii. 1.) "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate." (I. Cor. i.) Again: "Be not wise in your own conceits." (Rom. xii.. 16.) The views of our old brethren were in perfect harmony with the gospel as regards this matter, as will be seen by reference to the following queries and decisions:

Annual Meeting of 1831, Article 1: "Whether it was considered advisable for a member to have his son educated at a college? Considered not advisable, inasmuch as experience has taught that such very seldom will come back afterward to the humble ways of the Lord."

Annual Meeting of 1852, Article 22: "How is it considered by the brethren, if brethren aid and assist in building great houses for high schools, and send their children to the same? Considered that brethren should be very cautious, and not mind high things, but condescend to men of low estate." Rom. xii. 16.)

Annual Meeting of 1853, Article 28: "Is it right for a brother to go to college or teach in the same? Considered, that we would deem colleges a very unsafe place for a simple follower of Christ, inasmuch as they are calculated to lead us astray from the faith and obedience of the gospel." And in 1857, when the subject again came up, the answer of the Annual Meeting is definitely given thus: "IT IS CONFORMING TO THE WORLD. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth."

Thus we see that high schools were not permitted to come into the church for at least twenty-seven years after they were first urged.

2. Sabbath-schools, we consider to be more of human origin than by command of Christ or his apostles, and hence are more of a worldly custom than of gospel principle and authority; are not in harmony with the apostolic order of the church, the principles of the gospel, and were never sanctioned by the Annual Meeting in the way many are and will be conducted. Paul says, "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. vi. 4.) This command is given to PARENTS, and not to others.

3. Protracted or revival meetings, in the way they are generally conducted, are, we claim, not in harmony with the old order and the apostolic rules of the church. "And Paul, **as his manner was,** went in unto them, and three days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." (Acts xvii. 2.) Again: "And he reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath," etc. Again: "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath." (Acts xiii 42.) "And the next Sabbath-day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." (Acts xiii. 44.)

4. A salaried or paid ministry is also against the apostolic order. Hear Paul on this subject: "I have coveted no man's

silver, or gold, or apparel; yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me." (Acts xx. 34.) "What is my reward then? Verily that, when I preach the gospel, I make the gospel without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel." (I. Cor. ix. 18.) Again: "Neither did we eat any man's bread for naught, but wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you." (II Thess. iii. 8.) And when Christ sent forth His disciples, He forbade them the carrying or providing of gold or silver for their purses. These were to contribute **no part** of the considerations of the labors before them.

5. And with regard to the subject of feet-washing, what method had we best adopt to provide against the troubles growing out of having different modes of performing the ordinance among us. We hereby recommend and pray that the decision of 1872 be re-adopted by this meeting. The subject was brought before the elders of that Annual Meeting, a committee had been appointed, and a careful investigation made for a final decision of the matter; and after this special investigation and a thorough examination of this matter, the Annual Meeting decided to "make no change whatever in the mode and practice of feet-washing and stop the further agitation of the subject." And in 1876, when it again came up, it was decided that "no church can change from the double to the single mode on the authority of the Annual Meeting." Now, the decision of 1872 should, we think, have forever settled the feet-washing question, and to this we desire to hold as the order of the church, unless we can be convinced that the double mode is wrong, or that Christ will be pleased with different modes and practices of worship in His church. All do admit that the command is fulfilled by the ancient or general order, and why not abide by it? Why should we have such troubles in these last days with an ordinance that has so long stood under the blessings of God while the church prospered?

Dear brethren, in order to have permanent peace and union restored,—which we hope all are praying for,—we will have to deny ourselves of the recent inventions among us, and fall back and unite upon the principles of the gospel and the ancient principles and apostolic order of the church. Upon this we were all once united and satisfied until the innovations being alluded to crept in among us, which are now disturbing our peace. Can we not, dear brethren, all acknowledge that we were not watchful and guarded enough in suffering those things to come into the church, and repent for our want of faithfulness? **Forbearance,** we think, is the door through which these things came into the church, one after another, and now it seems there is no door to be found by which to get them out again.

Do not, dear brethren, find fault with us, and conclude we are taking too much upon us. We have, with sorrowful hearts, looked upon the very fast drift and movement of things in the church; and as all efforts to exterminate from the church the things which mar our peace have thus far failed, we saw no better course than the one presented. Our plain decisions have been disrespected and overruled, and if this state of things shall continue to exist we will lose all our power in the controlling of the church. We, for the present, can see no better plan by which to restore brotherly harmony and peace than to direct our efforts at the **causes** from whence the disunion arises.

Now we pray, dear brethren, that this may receive your prayerful and serious consideration; and our wish and desires are that it may pass the Annual Meeting without any compromise. Conrad Brumbaugh, Samuel Garber, Jacob Miller, David Murray, George V. Siler, Emanuel Miller, Joseph Arnold, Emanuel Hoover, Abraham Flory, David Brumbaugh, William Cassel, Samuel Murray, Nathan Haywood, Jesse Royer.

Answer: The elders of southern Ohio having gotten up this petition to Annual Meeting, and being very urgent that it be sent up, we, in district meeting, agree to send it up, but we as a district can not unitedly give it our approval.

The following resolutions and explanations embody the answers of the General Council to the petition:

WHEREAS, Our beloved fraternity has been considerably disturbed by brethren holding extreme views, some being disposed to enforce more rigorously the order of the church in regard to non-conformity to the world, and the principle of non-conformity to the world in giving form to our costume, than has commonly been done by our ancient brethren, while some on the other extreme would abandon the principle of non-conformity, so far as that principle has anything to do with giving form to our costume; and, WHEREAS, The principle of non-conformity in giving form to our costume, as well as in everything else, has been a peculiar characteristic of our fraternity, and is so stated in our written history, and has had its influence with our non-swearing and non-combatant and our general principles identifying our fraternity with the primitive and apostolic church in preserving us from the extravagant expenditures which both the religious and secular world have fallen into, and in obtaining for us as a body the character of simplicity, honesty, purity, and uprightness in the world; and WHEREAS, It is thought by many, and even so declared, that as a body we are opposed to all improvement and progress; and, WHEREAS, Contention and strife in the church are great obstacles in the way of both its holiness and its usefulness; therefore,

Resolved, 1. That we will labor in the spirit of the gospel and in brotherly love to maintain the principle of non-conformity in giving form to our costume, and in every way that the recognized peculiarities of our fraternity may require.

Resolved, 2. That while we declare ourselves conservative in maintaining unchanged what may justly be considered the principles and peculiarities of our fraternity, we also believe in the propriety and necessity of so adapting our labor and our principles to the religious wants of the world as will render our labor and principles most efficient in promoting the reformation of the world, the edification of the church, and the glory of God; hence, while we are "conservative," we are also **progressive.**

Resolved, 3. That brethren teaching through the press or ministry, or in any way, sentiments conflicting with the recognized principles and peculiarities of our fraternity, shall be considered offenders, and shall be dealt with as such; and to specify more particularly the subjects named in the petition we offer the following as an answer:

1. Inasmuch as there exists a wide-spread fear among us that the Brethren's high-schools are likely to operate against the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, as also likely to cultivate the desire for an exclusively educated ministry, to guard, therefore, these schools from producing these effects, we think the principles of these schools should meet and adopt rules that will prevent such tendency, and said rules be in harmony with the principles of Annual Meeting.

2. Sabbath-schools, when held in the spirit of the gospel, may be made a means of bringing up our children in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord." But should have no picnics and celebrations, or any vain things of the popular Sabbath-schools of the day connected with them.

3. All meetings for worship should be held as our stated or regular meetings are held, and we be cautious not to use such means as are calculated to get persons into the church without

a gospel version, such as over-persuasion or excitement, simply to get them into the church, but use the gospel means to get them to turn away from sin.

4. In regard to a paid ministry, we believe that it is not right in the sense for brethren to go and labor for churches in the hope of receiving money for services, and the offer of money as an inducement to brethren to preach; but to poor ministers who are faithful both in the doctrine and practice of the church, we would encourage giving towards their necessities, as also defraying the expenses of traveling in attending to church interests.

5. Inasmuch as our old fathers have always admitted the **validity of the two modes of feet-washing,** and as much as we desire a more perfect union in this matter, we can not condemn either mode as being invalid. And inasmuch as former decisions have failed to settle the question to the satisfaction of all, we advise more forbearance and liberty to the conscience of our brethren in this matter, because both have been practiced among us, and the best way to stop the agitation of this question, is to allow the same liberty of conscience for our brethren that we ask for ourselves. **But this shall not be construed to annul the present decisions and advice of Annual Meeting.**

(Recon. Min.)
1884 SEC. 44. In reconsidering minutes of 1880, Article 23, of Supplemental Minutes, we find the answer to the Miami Valley Petition not to be in harmony with the former usages of the church. Hence we do not accept said answer nor the "Substitute" Petition.* Also, in 1881, Article 22, we find a decision that it (the above substitute and answer) remain **unchanged.**

For man to make such decisions is **unscriptural.** Therefore for the above reasons we are dissatisfied with the answer given, inasmuch as the counsels of our Yearly Meetings only give advice instead of making **unalterable laws.** The foregoing are among the reasons why the Miami Valley Petition and Resolutions were adopted. (Accepted.)

1884 *PUBLISHER'S NOTE.—The decision alluded to reads as follows: "ARTICLE 23, 1880. **Resolved,** That the decisions in regard to what is called the Miami Valley elders' petition is as near right as any that can be reached upon the questions embodied in said petition; and the prosperity of the brotherhood demands that said decision of Annual Conference of 1880 **re-**

main unchanged. Answer: We decide that it remain unchanged."

1912 Inasmuch as there has come to the standing committee of this meeting a petition originated and circulated by Joseph K. Metzger, Daniel V. Skiles, and Samuel W. Yost, and signed by a number of others, finding fault after having accepted of the work done by the committee sent by Yearly Meeting of 1911 to adjust difficulties in the Middle Fork and Deer Creek Churches of Indiana, by misrepresentation and exposure of work done in said churches, and, further, by circulating the same in church districts of other States, thereby sowing discord among brethren contrary to Gospel rule and order.

Therefore, we, the standing committee, in union agree that said brethren did very wrong and should make an humble acknowledgment before this meeting; and, inasmuch as Brother Yost not being present here, our conclusions shall be entrusted to the care of his adjoining elders to require the same of him in his home church.

There was another local petition presented to us for consideration containing matter censuring the committee in their work in the Deer Creek congregation which we find by evidence before us, contains matter that cannot be sustained. Therefore, we can do nothing in the matter.

There was also another local petition containing matter from the Middle Fork and Deer Creek Churches, the contents of which are similar to those read, and hence are answered in former answer of standing committee.

The standing committee's disposition of the above petitions was ratified by the meeting.

PETITION TO THE YEARLY MEETING

Pomona, Kansas, Nov. 23, A. D. 1913

1913 In view of the councils given by the brethren assembled together in council in the Wolf Creek arm of the church, Montgomery County, Ohio, on the eighth day of December, A. D. 1880, touching the rights of members petitioning Yearly Meeting, we now tenderly and prayerfully petition the Yearly Meeting of A. D. 1913 to seriously consider the present condition of our beloved brotherhood caused by the conflicting opinions existing among us whereby some minutes are enforced and made binding, while others are allowed to be of no effect, causing contention and strife among us, we now ask the Yearly Meeting to make all the conclusions of Yearly Meeting obligatory, according to the minutes of the Yearly Meeting of A. D.

1860. Art. 1, and to further specify our requests regarding some of the points causing confusion, we hereby ask the Yearly Meeting to allow no automobiles, no telephones, no political voting, no insurance, and as the wearing of gold as it is appearing in these modern times is contrary to the Gospel, we petition further, that other substitutes less offensive be used so as to abstain from all appearance of evil, and all and anything that has been concluded against. In short, that we show consistency regarding the conclusions of the Yearly Meeting pertaining to our non-conformity principles. The above petition was signed by ninety-five members.

Answer to Petition: In view of the Wolf Creek council referred to in the Pomona petition of November 23, 1912, we wish to say that the object and purpose of the Wolf Creek council of December 8, 1880, was a mutual work among the elders and housekeepers generally, and was agreed upon by all throughout the brotherhood, and the date and place published for all who should feel to meet and consult together as to the points of difference at that time existing in the church, giving equal rights and privileges to elders, officials, and the laity by church ruling. Here we see a wide difference between the Wolf Creek council and the Pomona council. The former was done mutually according to general church government, while the Pomona council was entirely one sided as to the rights and privileges of petitioning, etc.

Hence we plainly see that that council cannot be consistently referred to as a precedent for that of the petitioners, and would not be right to be referred to as a precedent, inasmuch as stated above the general brotherhood had no knowledge of the said council and was not conferred with as taught by the golden rule, "To do unto others as we would have others do to us."

Now as to the church making all her decisions obligatory she has never done so, as the conclusions of the fathers evidence to us. And in regard to the points specified in the petition for which consideration is asked, some of which are under consideration at this meeting; due respect will be given to same when they come up in regular order.

Now in consideration of all of the foregoing, the elders of the church consulted together and concluded to have a conference with all aggrieved officials, and extended a kind and loving invitation to all such to meet them on the 9th of May on the meeting ground to which no respect was shown, they failing to manifest any interest in same by their non-appearance.

Notwithstanding all the above we still earnestly desire that all might come and labor together for the good of souls.

To be sent to the dissatisfied by the order of the meeting.

Passed by the meeting to go on record on the minutes.

PETITION TO YEARLY MEETING OF 1915

Modesto, Calif., April 7, 1915

To the Old German Baptist Brethren, assembled in Yearly Meeting of 1915, we send Greeting:

1915 Due to the very serious condition into which we, as a congregation have fallen, there being a divided sentiment touching the matter of fellowshipping those who have withdrawn from us, we therefore ask that Yearly Meeting send representative brethren to instruct and set in order the things wanting.

Chas. B. Rumble, George Montgomery, J. A. Cover, J. E. Blickenstaff, Jacob Blickenstaff, C. L. Woodbridge, M. J. Montgomery, Mary A. Rumble, Mary H. Cover, E. J. Duncan, Gertie Blickenstaff, Leanna Peters, Anna Rumble, Orpha E. Flory, Carrie Marconett, Alice Bowman, Olive Bowman, Rhoda Rumble, O. F. Flory, Esther V. Hiestand, Asa A. Peters, Mary C. Peters, William Edgecomb, J. R. Edgecomb, Martha Edgecomb, Mary Terkelson, Ruth Rumble.

Answer: This Yearly Meeting grants the above petition and suggests that the following brethren compose the committee to the Modesto, California, Church: Jacob D. Miller, George W. Balsbaugh, Ephraim Brumbaugh, John F. Flora, Isaac P. Stitely. The said church and the general brotherhood to see that the expenses of same are met. Accepted by Yearly Meeting.

PETITION FOR MINUTE BOOKS

1916 We, the members of the North Fork Church, Carroll County, Indiana, petition Annual Meeting of 1916 to formulate some plan to have another edition of the minute book published to include all minutes up to the present as all former editions are exhausted; and there are a number of young brethren and some older ones, that would like to have minute books but cannot get them.

Answer: Petition granted and Brethren J. M. Kimmel, Wm. N. Kinsey, and David Onkst appointed to get minute books printed.

A PETITION TO THE YEARLY MEETING OF 1918

Inasmuch as several petitions were before the Y. M. of 1917 asking for a strong committee of faithful elders to adjust troubles in different parts of the brotherhood wherever said troubles existed, and the Y. M. of 1917 granted a committee. After said committee had investigated some of said troubles, they failed to unite or agree to decisions or findings and to adjust and set in order what was wanting, and so failed to reconcile the grave troubles existing. We therefore ask the Standing Committee through Y. M. to investigate why said committee of elders did not adjust their findings on said troubles existing and reconcile the offending ones.

Signed: J. D. Mohler, John L. Wade, David Miller, J. B. Warner, Isaac Lavy, M. V. Cool.

The conclusion of the meeting with reference to the situation as set forth in the foregoing report of the committee and petition was to send back the committee to the affected churches to try to effect a reconciliation in the matters investigated by them last year as best they can.

Hymn Book Committee

1921 It was suggested that Brethren J. C. Darst and J. M. Kimmel be appointed on the Hymn Book Committee, with Brethren Jonathan Wenrick and William N. Kinsey, the only surviving members of said committee, and that they be advised to get another supply of hymn books made. Approved and passed.

Tent Committee

1921 We your Tent Committee, in council, have agreed, 1st, to relieve Bro. Frank Petry, by his request, from keeping our treasury, and to have Bro. Ezra Denlinger appointed in his stead; 2nd, to relieve Bro. Jacob Diehl, by his request from the committee and to have Bro. David W. Stitely appointed in his stead; 3rd, to relieve Bro. John S. Jamison, by his request, from our committee and to have Bro. N. E. Bowman appointed in his stead; 4th, to relieve Bro. Samuel Churchbaugh from our committee, and to have Bro. D. H. Howser appointed in his stead, the former having removed. Submitted for approval of Standing Committee. Frank Petry, Eldorado, Ohio. N. M. Lesher, Chambersburg, Pa. Approved and passed.

Vindicator Committee

1921 Three members of the Vindicator Committee, viz. Brethren Amos Hyre, Benjamin A. Frantz and Henry Garber, having departed this life, we who remain of the committee have chosen Brethren Samuel Leedy, John F. Shaeffer and George Bowser as members of the staff, subject to approval of Annual Meeting.

J. D. Mohler, I. H. Cool, Samuel Stoneroad. Approved and passed.

Vindicator Committee

1925 We, the Vindicator Committee, have chosen Elder Philip Miller to serve with us on the editorial staff of the Vindicator subject to the approval of the Annual Meeting. Samuel Stoneroad, Samuel Ledy, John F. Schaeffer, Geo. Bowser, J. M. Kimmel, B. E. Beckner. Passed.

Adjustment of Certain Irregularities Affecting Two A. M. Committees to the Middle Fork Church, Indiana

1928 Petition No. 1.

To Annual Meeting of 1928, Greeting:

Two papers originating in the bounds of the Middle Fork Church, Rossville, Indiana and adjoining churches, gravely charging both the Standing Committee of 1926 and a committee sent by Annual Meeting of 1926 to adjust troubles affecting the Middle Fork Church, of irregularities, came before the Annual Meeting of 1927. These charges are entirely unfounded, no fixed rule having been laid down by Annual Meeting previous to 1927 touching the points upon which these charges are based. We therefore pray Annual Meeting of 1928 to demand the originators, circulators and signers of said papers to make a hearty acknowledgment to Annual Meeting of 1928 for bringing said charges, so that errors connected with the aforesaid matter, made during the session of Annual Meeting of 1927 or thereafter, may be corrected at this meeting of 1928, and thus promote and maintain peace in our beloved brotherhood. See Article 31, 1867; Article 1, 1908; also 1912 entitled, Petition to Yearly Meeting. **Petition No. 2.**

There was a committee sent to the Middle Fork church, Ind., by A. M. of 1926 whose report was accepted by all concerned. A protest was presented against said report to the Standing Committee of 1927, so they failed to read said report to A. M., thereby violating minutes, Art. 1, 1908; also Art. 31, 1867, and instead suggested another committee to investigate grievances against said committee's labors. Said suggestion was ratified by the A. M. of 1927. but the second committee instead of doing so, declared the former committee illegally sent and their labors null and void, which is causing great dissatisfaction and must be adjusted to restore peace and union.

Therefore we pray A. M. of 1928 to take up this matter in regular order as unfinished business: First, to read the first committee's report as query No. 1. Then read protest papers. Then because of these protests against the foreman of A. M., investigating committee and Standing Committee of 1926.

We pray the A. M. of 1928 to grant the first committee the privilege to fully explain their labors and report protested against after all had accepted. Then let the A. M. of 1928 pass upon it.

Two other petitions on the same subject and similar import as the two foregoing were brought to this meeting.

Standing Committee's Conclusion

We, the Standing Committee of the Annual Meeting of 1928, in view of the divided sentiment in relation to the irregularity of sending both committees to the Middle Fork church, Ind., conclude to recommend to lay down the work of both committees and leave the matter where the church had left it before either committee had labored, except the appointment of Bro. O. A. Custer to take charge of said Middle Fork church. On the other hand we recommend to recognize the ordination of Bro. Solomon Stoner.

Furthermore we conclude that there were some irregularities in sending both committees. Therefore, we the Standing Committees of 1926 and also of 1927 acknowledge to the Brotherhood that we erred in suggesting said committees, especially in not reading the report of the committee of 1926 in violation of minutes of A. M. 1908, Art. 1, and ask A. M. of 1928 to pardon us; and in order to do it consistently we decide that each one of us, individually of both Standing Committees, make said acknowledgment to the A. M. of 1928.

Furthermore it was agreed by the Standing Committees, respectively, of 1926 and 1927, and all the elders present in the Elders' Council, that We, the Standing Committee of 1928, recommend to all that made hard or unbecoming remarks either by statements or by writing, to make some concessions to A. M. of 1928 in order that a better feeling and union may be restored in our beloved Brotherhood. It was further agreed that it would be good that some admonition be given to all to be more careful in the future.

The above conclusions of the Standing Committee was read and passed, and the individual acknowledgments and concessions therein recommended were made satisfactory to the meeting.

The report of the committee sent by the A. M. of 1927 to the Beaverdam congregation, Maryland, was read, but was laid down.

A proposition was then offered to send another committee to said church, but was also laid down.

1929 ART. 1. **(1)** Inasmuch as some years ago matters of material things caused dissension and confusion insomuch that some members withdrew from our fellowship and have been separated from us, but now desire fellowship with us again as indicated through tongue and pen, and as presented to A. M. of 1928, by a petition according to request given them at A. M. of 1927.

The petition that was presented to the A. M. of 1928 is as follows:

"To the Yearly Meeting of 1928 to be held in Montgomery County, Ohio: Inasmuch as it seems desirable, in the minds of many that some steps be taken toward an effort to confer together with a view to consider terms of peace and reuniting,

Therefore, we the undersigned, as members of the part of the church organized under the name of the Old Brethren, wish to hereby offer the Yearly Meeting of 1928 to be held in Montgomery County, Ohio, to meet if the Lord is willing in some way as she may deem proper for the above purpose." Signed: S. W. Yost, O. C. Cripe, Edward Royer, D. V. Skiles, D. A. Skiles, D. W. Miller, Adam Blocher.

Inasmuch as the above petition was not presented to A. M. according to our order for consideration, but Standing Committee, after considering the same, did recognize it, and appointed a committee of three (3) elders without the consent of Annual Meeting, and therefore irregular, and is causing great confusion in the brotherhood by such irregular action.

Therefore we earnestly request that this matter be brought before the A. M. and have considered the propriety and necessity of naming a committee of 5 or more elders who have not been connected with the controversy in the past, to meet with the Old Brethren as per their request. See Minutes of 1882, Art. 2: "It shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to see that all the business is properly brought before the General Council." Also Minutes, Book 1, page 401, Art. 14.

(2) Inasmuch as some of our brethren some years ago became dissatisfied with the decision as adopted on the telephone question and other matters, and withdrew their fellowship, but now see matters differently and want to be again united with us, and therefore brought a petition to Annual Meeting of 1928, which in substance requests a rehearing or an official interview.

The Standing Committee of 1928 considered the same and appointed a committee of three elders to confer with them, without the consent of A. M. and without authority. We earnestly pray Annual Meeting of 1929 to consider the same in a regular way according to order and appoint a committee of 7 or more elders that have not been connected in the past with the cause of differences, to meet with the Old Brethren, and if possible to form a Christian basis to again unite us in fellowship. See Minutes 1866, Art. 11, Page 309. Minutes 1859, Art. 35, page 236. Romans 15: 1-8. James 3:17, 18. Matthew 18:18.

(3) Inasmuch as some of our brethren some years ago became confused with the decisions as adopted on the telephone question and other matters and withdrew fellowship, but now see matters differently and want to be again in union with us, and therefore brought a petition to Annual Meeting of 1928 which in substance desires an interview authorized by Annual Meeting, we therefore pray Annual Meeting of 1929 to consider the matter in a regular way according to order and appoint a committee of elders that have not been connected in the past with the cause of differences, to meet with them and, if possible form a Christian basis to again unite us in fellowship. Our committee shall report their conclusion to the Annual Meeting of 1930. See Minutes of 1866, Art. 11. Also Matt. 7:12, Romans 15:1-8.

Petition of The Old Brethren

Inasmuch as a number of our official brethren sent a paper to A. M. of 1928 offering an interview relative to forming some plan whereby we once united members could again be in fellowship, but the papers failed in the object intended as A. M. of 1928 did not act upon it. Therefore we the undersigned wish to hereby assure the A. M. of 1928 held at North Manchester, Indiana, we stand ready as a year ago and welcome a meeting as above referred to. Signed: S. W. Yost, O. C. Cripe, Edward Royer, D. V. Skiles, Leah Skiles, D. M. Miller, Adam Blocher, D. A. Skiles, James Wolf, Noah Skiles, Hettie Skiles, Mary Yost, Mary Skiles, Ora Skiles.

Answer: We the Standing Committee of 1929 suggest to send the following five brethren as a committee to meet with the Old Brethren in council to try to form a Gospel basis upon which to unite the two bodies in one brotherhood: Elders John F. Shaeffer, Ohio, G. Paul Custer, Ohio, Samuel Leedy, Ohio, Levi Miller, Ind., Jacob B. Flora, Ind. Substitute Ira Metzger, Ohio.

This Annual Meeting endorses the committee named and assumes to pay the expenses that may be incurred.

Debt on Meeting House at Lakeland, Florida

To the Brethren Assembled at A. M., Greeting:

1928 Inasmuch as a body of members located near Lakeland, Fla., and requested Annual Meeting of 1926 to organize them a church district, the Standing Committee investigated their request and recommended to Annual Meeting to place the matter into the hands of the Virginia Elders to look after, which they did; and as they built a plain church house and went in debt for the greater portion of the building, and

Whereas the general brotherhood was appealed to for assistance, and responded to the appeal, but still a debt remained of $531.35, and

Whereas the brotherhood was likely to lose the title unless the balance was paid at once,

Therefore, the Virginia Elders raised $500 and took up the loan, and again the Standing Committee appealed to the Brotherhood through A. M. of 1927 to make a free will offering to cover the loan. The response was $57.70.

Now, therefore, will not this Annual Meeting suggest some plan to meet this obligation by the way of an assessment or otherwise to take care of the Virginia brethren, and thereby show to one another that we are brethren in deed and in truth? Rom. 13:8; 1 John 3:18.

It is no more a local debt; it is a debt of the Brotherhood to the Virginia brethren. Some 16 districts of the Brotherhood have not contributed anything, and some contributed liberally. If those districts would raise 30 or 40 cents a member and the districts who have contributed raise 15 to 20 cents a member, that would be sufficient, and any collections over the amount needed could be placed in the general fund for tent expense.

Submitted for your earnest consideration.

Answer: In view of the above conditions we, your Standing Committee, suggest to A. M. that they appeal to the churches of the Brotherhood to make an effort to raise this amount and send the sum to the Virginia Elders (in care of Bro. J. E. Brubaker, R. F. D. No. 1, Salem, Va.) thereby releasing said obligation. Passed by the meeting.

Debt On Lakeland, Florida Meeting House

To A. M. of 1930. Greeting:

1930 Report of balance due Virginia elders for money loaned to pay off debt on meeting-house at Lakeland, Fla.

Amt. due according to report of A. M. 1929	$76.95
Received since A. M. of 1929	11.50
Balance yet unpaid	65.45

Signed, J. E. Brubaker.

We the Standing Committee recommend that our Brotherhood meet the obligation thus asumed and that elders take the matter up with their congregation and raise the money to pay off the debt as soon as possible. In case of a surplus refer to the minutes of A. M. 1929.

Resignation Accepted

Whittier, Calif., May 3, 1930

To the Standing Committee of 1930 and the Brotherhood, Greeting:

1930 Inasmuch as the A. M. of 1928 refused to accept my resignation of the charge of the Whittier Church, I now renew my request to be relieved of said charge having succeeded in strengthening the official body of the church electing two ministers of the first degree, and by tendering my resignation to the church to take effect July 1, 1930, which said church unitedly agreed to accept subject to the approval of the Standing Committee and the Brotherhood.

Signed, JOHN F. FLORA.

The above request granted by A. M. without objection.

Members in Canada to Be Organized

1931 Elders Leander Miller, G. P. Custer and Edward C. Miller were appointed to effect an organization of the members who reside in Ontario, Canada.

Church in Canada Organized

1932 The organization of the Don River Church, Ontario, Canada, was effected by authority of the A. M. of 1931, under the direction of Elders G. P. Custer, E. C. Miller, and Ira Metzger, who submitted their report of the work, which was accepted by the meeting.

Appointment On Vindicator Committee

1933 We, the Vindicator Committee, have chosen Elder David Mohler to serve with us as a member of the editorial staff of The Vindicator, subject to the approval of Annual Meeting. Approved by Annual Meeting.

1936 The first matter before the conference was with regard to certain errors in the ruling of the conference of 1935 for which the Foreman and Standing Committtee of said conference were held responsible. For said errors the members present of the Standing Committee of said conference of 1935, individually and voluntarily confessed and asked pardon.

A Proposition of the Standing Committee

1937 Relative to the Wood Colony Church, near Modesto, California. To the Annual Meeting convened: We the Standing Committee of the A. M. of 1937 put the following proposition to the Brotherhood:

1937 In view of the lamentable and divided condition of the Wood Colony church, near Modesto, California, and all the means and efforts by the Brotherhood having been exhausted, and the matter still not being put to rest, the adjoining elders having been there a second time, also a committee from A. M. and another appeal having been made to the Standing Committee and the A. M. of 1937, the following proposition is hereby made to said church:

Let each side select two elders, and these four select another elder, to come to the Wood Colony church, with a view of dividing the district into two separate church districts. These five elders shall first let the members of the church make their own decision as to the line of the districts. If they can not agree, then leave it to the five elders to make any other adjustment the five brethren may deem necessary to effect a division of the district.

It is hereby understood that these brethren may not take up any matter whatsoever, only the dividing the district. After the line shall have been established, the members shall be called together and a statement of the division be made to the church that matters of the past be now definitely and permanently dropped, with the exception of such matters as are hereinafter mentioned. It is hereby further understood that neither of these, now two districts, may interfere with labors of the other district, but shall labor together as neighboring districts irrespective of what has taken place in the past.

All the officials shall be in their official capacity as they now stand and as accepted by the A. M. of 1936. In case there are members who have violated the Gospel and church order whose cases have not been dealt with they may be dealt with as is seen proper by the officials and the church of the district into which they have now fallen. In case there are those who could not be satisfied with some of the elders who have labored in the Wood Colony church in the past, the matter may be looked after and taken care of by the districts where these elders have their membership, irrespective of the Wood Colony church.

In case either of the districts might desire the assistance of these five brethren after the district is divided, they may so assist by the united sanction of the official body of the district.

It is hereby understood and agreed that the labors done by the Wood Colony church and the five brethren shall not be reported back to Standing Committee or Annual Meeting for acceptance or rejection. But that this shall be the closing of the troubles now existing in the Wood Colony church, that all may go on laboring for the glory of God, the good of the church and the salvation of souls.

Accepted by the meeting.

Petition No. 1

1938 A petition from the Cedar Creek church, Anderson County, Kansas, to the Annual Meeting of 1938, through the Standing Committee, relative to the work of Bro. Maurice A. Hess in college, was given due consideration by the Standing Committee which body concluded to advise as follows:

We, the Standing Committee of the Annual Meeting of 1938, agree to advise the Cedar Creek church to still stay by the last committee's decision (in the Maurice A. Hess case) which was accepted by the Brotherhood at that time, and still bear with Brother Hess out of communion, and further, advise him to comply with the committee's advice.

The above advice of the Standing Committee was accepted by the Annual Meeting.

Petition No. 2

An appeal to the Annual Meeting of 1938, through the Standing Committee, from the Sand Creek church, Pratt County, Kansas, relative to the John H. Garber case was submitted to the Conference by the Standing Committee.

After an extended consideration of the matter involved in the above appeal, the advice of the Annual Meeting is that the Sand Creek church select a committee according to Article 8, 1937.

Petition No. 3

A petition to the Annual Meeting of 1938, from the New River district of the church, Whittier, California, for counsel to settle the differences and difficulties existing in said district, together with an opposite explanation.

Petition to Annual Meeting of 1939

1939 We, the members of the State of Michigan humbly urge the Annual Meeting of 1939 assembled, to mend the act of

1935, on financial aid for isolated churches, so as to include the State of Michigan, as we are few in number and very much isolated. Answer: We grant the request of this petition. Accepted with its answer.

The Vindicator Committee

1939 We the undersigned members of the Vindicator Committee have chosen Elders H. M. Fisher and Levi Bowman to fill vacancies and serve with us on said committee, subject to the approval of the Annual Meeting. Samuel Leedy, George Bowser, J. M. Kimmel, B. E. Beckner, David Mohler. Appointments confirmed by the meeting.

Petition to A. M. by the Standing Committee

1939 We your Standing Committee of 1939, again having had papers placed in our hands to come before the council, again placing us in a condition where we can neither go forward nor stand still.

Therefore, we pray this Annual Meeting to restore to the Standing Committee the privilege as was practiced by the fathers in arranging the business to come before the Annual Meeting. "Let all things be done decently and in order." 1 Cor. 14:40. Accepted by the Meeting.

Index for the Book of Minutes

1940 To the Standing Committee of the A. M. of 1940, Greeting: I have an index for the minutes of A. M. 1778 to 1939 including also the Resolutions of 1881, which I desire to give to the Brotherhood provided she will accept it and see to the publishing of it as she does the minutes, etc. I ask no temporal interest in it. My name need not appear in it, and the wording of the preface can be changed to suit. Isaac H. Bashore.

A committee of three (to consist of Brethren J. M. Kimmel, Arthur R. King, and Ervan Eikenberry) was proposed to look into the matter and have the same printed if they see fit. Confirmed by the A. M.

PART III

Reports to Annual Meeting

1854 ART. 1. Report of the committee appointed last year on the subject of slavery. (See Minutes of 1853, Art. 9.) The question having been, "How shall any branch of the church proceed in case an individual wishes to become a member who is in possession of slaves, and the law of the state in which they live is such that they can not manumit them in safety, without transporting them beyond its limits?"

"Agreeable to the ninth query of Yearly Meeting of 1853, concerning slavery, the committee appointed to report the same have had this subject under serious consideration, in the fear of the Lord, and do report as follows:

"First, Under no circumstances can slavery be admitted into the church.

"Second, In all cases where a holder of a slave or slaves wishes to become a member in the church, he is required to manumit all his slaves before baptism, upon the following conditions: The males to go out free at the age of twenty-one, and the females at the age of eighteen years. All those over and above these ages, when manumitted, are to be paid by their former owner such a sum, either in money or goods, as may be judged right by the church in which the case may occur, and which is considered as the best judge, being acquainted with all the circumstances—as a compensation for their services over age. This will enable the manumitted to migrate to a land of liberty, and will relieve the conscience of the liberator from the burden of taking with him to the bar of God the wages of oppression."

This report was adopted, after a lengthy discussion by the meeting.

1856 ART.14. The committee appointed at last Annual Meeting to visit and confer with the far Western brethren, or a committee of them, to investigate the differences in doctrine and practice existing between them and us, submitted the following report:

"May 8, 1856. We, the brethren who constitute the committee appointed by the German Baptist Church, at our last Annual Meeting, to visit the Western brethren who recognize Bro. George Wolfe, of Illinois, as their bishop, by the grace and favor of God were permitted to meet at their meeting-house, where we were received on the most friendly and Christian-like terms, and after different queries were proposed for our deliberation, the three (or four) following being considered the most important, we proceed to make our report accordingly, as follows:

"First, The question concerning the reality of a devil was considered, and after comparing opinions and sentiments on the reality of such a being, and his nature, we agreed upon the following view: That the Scriptures recognize a devil, or an evil spirit, that manifests itself in the flesh.

"Second. On the doctrine of universal salvation, which denies punishment hereafter, we cordially agreed with Bro. Wolfe that all men shall receive hereafter according to the deeds done in the body, whether they be good or bad.

"Third. On the subject of feet-washing, Bro. Wolfe is firm in the opinion that one person should both wash and wipe the feet of a number of brethren, and then another, and so on, until all are washed; but he is willing to conform to the practice of the brethren in general, when in communion-meeting with them, and begs for forbearance on the part of the brethren in general, until they shall all come to see alike.

"Fourth. Bro. Wolfe is likewise strongly of the opinion that no time should be spent between the eating of the supper and the breaking of bread (the communion) but, that the whole ceremony should be presented without intermission or delay.

"It is the sincere desire of Bro. Wolfe that, however these sentiments may clash with the general practice of the brethren, they may not be considered a sufficient cause why they should not be received in communion and fellowship with the brethren; with which views we, the committee, unanimously agree, and present this our report to the brethren in general council met, for their deliberation and concurrence.

"Signed by David Hardman, J. H. Umstad, J. H. Tracey, A. Moss, John Metzger, S. Lehman, C. Long."

1869 ART. 2. The committee appointed by the last Annual Meeting to visit the Philadelphia and Germantown churches, reported, and the following is the part of the report judged necessary to be entered upon the minutes, it being the result of the conference between the committee and said churches: "Whereas, the brethren of the Philadelphia and Germantown churches seem to feel assured that the practice of feet-washing in said churches has always been in the single mode, we find it necessary to bear with one another, and will do so, provided you restore the old order of the brethren, in having a full supper at communion meeting, the salutation of the kiss at the same time, and the practice of the two brethren praying at the commencement and close of our general meetings for worship, where there are two brethren present; concluding each prayer with the Lord's Prayer. If you will agree to this, we will report to the Annual Meeting accordingly. This was the last proposition submitted by the committee to said churches, and was accepted, with the qualification, as far as practicable. We are happy to believe its acceptance will be a step toward a more complete union between the churches we met in conference and the general brotherhood. The foregoing report is respectfully submitted to the Annual Meeting, with the hope that it will take such action upon the subject as will further the blessed cause of truth and righteousness. Signed by the committee: D. P. Sayler, H. D. Davy, J. Quinter, B. F. Moomaw, M. Miller." This Annual Meeting accepts, for the present, the foregoing report, with the clause, "as far as practicable," stricken out.

Report of the brethren appointed by the Annual Meeting to visit the brethren in Adams and Hancock counties, Illinois: "Upon conferring with them, and investigating the subject of difference in the practice of feet-washing, we found that in presenting their papers to the Annual Meeting of 1859, they reserved the right to themselves of practicing feet-washing as they did before, and thereby the Annual Meeting got a wrong impression; and, furthermore, what confirmed that impression was this: they agreed in the paper above alluded to, to give and take counsel, and did not state to the Annual Meeting their reservation in the practice of feet-washing. We found, in our conference with them, that they are still willing to abide by the compromise made in 1856, and fellowship the brethren as it was then agreed upon by the Annual Meeting. And we further got an expression from them, that they have adopted, and will adopt, the minutes of the Annual Meeting in full, except in the practice of feet-washing. And, as we learned by investigation, that there was a misunderstanding between the parties, we laid down our power invested in us by the Annual Meeting to communicate, and return our report to the Annual Meeting, that it may act as it sees fit in the premises. And we further have to say, that we were kindly met and received by the brethren and sisters in Adams and Hancock counties, and found a Christian spirit manifested in them while we were with them, and only feel sorry that we could not effect a union in the practice of feet-washing.

Signed by the committee: H. D. Davy, John Metzger, Samuel Lehman, Christian Long."

Whereas, there has been a misunderstanding between the brethren in Illinois, visited by the committee, and the Annual Meeting; and, whereas, said brethren have accepted of the decisions of the Annual Meeting, and conformed to the order of the church in every respect except in the order of feet-washing; and, whereas, the different modes of washing feet have been much agitated among the brethren for some time past, neither to the edification of the brethren, nor to the promotion of holiness in the church; and, whereas, this Annual Meeting has given counsel, which, it is hoped, will stop said agitation and let the subject rest; therefore, this Annual Meeting concludes to bear a little longer with said brethren, and see what the result will be. It also advises brethren, when organizing new churches, to organize them in the practice of the ordinances, according to the general order of the brethren.

1870 ART. 7. Whereas, S. Z. Sharp and H. R. Holsinger have drawn forth many expressions of censure, and have evidently greatly wounded the feelings of the members of the standing committee of last Annual Meeting, and also of very many members of the church, by the publication of certain reports that reflect very unfavorably upon the conduct of said committee; therefore, the brethren composing the western district of Maryland, in district-council assembled, do request the Annual Meeting to appoint a committee to investigate the facts of the case and determine what acknowledgments or satisfaction must be made to restore harmony and love again, and this to be attended to at the Annual Meeting of 1870. The foregoing request was granted, and Samuel Garber, D. B. Sturgis, Jacob Miller, Daniel Wolf, and John Crist, were appointed a committee of investigation. In due time the following report of the committee was submitted to the meeting and adopted: We, the committee appointed by this Annual Meeting to investigate the cause of grievances set forth in Art. 7, after carefully investigating the matter, decide as follows: First: Bro. H. R. Holsinger assumed an unprecedented and unjustifiable course in employing a reporter without authority from the church. Second: In not regarding the counsel of the last Annual Meeting (Art. 1, clause fourth), in publishing S. Z. Sharp's letter, casting severe reflections on the standing committee, which Bro. H. R. Holsinger knew, or ought to have known, was a misrepresentation of the facts in the case proved to us. Third: In answering the defense of the standing committee, his criticism and language were unbecoming a brother. (See "Christian Family Companion," Vol. V, No. 45, pp. 696, 697, 698.) And we also find that the committee did no more than duty required of them in rejecting the reporter. It is also clearly proved to us that the committee offered Bro. H. R. Holsinger all the privileges he formerly enjoyed, to make his own report.

In consideration of the above, we require, in order to restore peace and harmony, that Bro. H. R. Holsinger acknowledge that he did wrong, and that he asks the forgiveness of the church. S. Garber, D. B. Sturgis, J. Miller, D. Wolf, J. Crist. After the reading of the report, Bro. H. R. Holsinger made an acknowledgment satisfactory to the meeting.

1873 ART. 8. Whereas, Bro. H. R. Holsinger has committed great offense to the brethren at our present Annual Meeting by pursuing the course he has. When complaints had been presented from various places or districts in the brotherhood of the language he used in his paper, and when a humble and meek explanation was expected by the brethren, he, before the whole congregation, made assertions and insinuations which grieved the brethren more than his previous offenses, and to the dishonor of the brotherhood. 1. The spirit that he, as a minister of the gospel, manifested, we consider altogether contrary to the gospel, and the profession and character of our brotherhood. 2. He declared that a brother, and the connection in which he made the remark showed that it was a brother of some eminence, would suppress the printing of the Bible. With no testimony before him warranting him to make such a declaration, we consider the charge a dishonor to the brotherhood. 3. In speaking against a brother, in warm and strong language, and in alluding to the business that had been done in the morning, which business pertained to a point which had given the brethren much trouble, but which was apparently settled quite as satisfactorily as could have been expected, and when we felt pleasantly over it, he said, alluding especially to the elders, "They were asked to give the words of the Lord, and refused to do so.' We consider this remark, in the connection in which it was used, injurious to the influence of the elders. 4. In saying that one of the brethren used sophistry in his speech, we consider a great violation of Christian courtesy and brothely love. 5. In declaring that he would never submit to a certain restraint that was under consideration, he plainly showed a spirit of disobedience and insubordination to the church. The offenses alluded to in the foregoing were by no means confined to the elders or standing committee, but they were very extensive in the congregation. The impropriety of the unchristian course pursued, grieved a large number of members, as their strong feelings, expressed after the meeting closed, plainly indicated. Now, in view of the foregoing considerations, we consider a very humble acknowledgment of Bro. H. R. Holsinger, for his offenses, and an assurance that his course in the future shall be more respectful to the church and elders, and more in accordance with the meekness and brotherly love inculcated in the gospel. An acknowledgment was made, and the assurance given.

1875 ART. 34. Report of the committee to California: We, the undersigned, a committee sent by the Annual Meeting to set in order things that are wanting among the brethren in California, met pursuant to appointment, agreed upon by the elders and brethren residing here, at the house of Bro. Michael Sissler, and after a season of devotion and consultation as to the legality of the proceedings, Bro. George Wolf, with a number of brethren, retired for private consultation. They returning, the voice was taken to decide whether or not the committee is received to investigate the difficulties existing, and they were accepted by a unanimous vote of the members present. We then proceeded as follows:

First: To examine the reasons why certain members did not hand in their letters to the church:

Reason 1st: That a committee of four brethren waited on Elder Wolf, to try to effect a union, and requested him to appoint a church-meeting for that purpose, which he refused to do, but said that if they would agree to hand in their letters, he would call a church-meeting for that purpose (no other), and if they would agree to be subject to the established order of the church in California, and say nothing about settled matters.

It being proved to our satisfaction that there was disorder in the church, and Elder Wolf refusing to call the church together to investigate matters, we decide that he erred in this, and that it was a sufficient reason for withholding their letters.

Reason 2d: That there were two cases of adultery in the church, and that Elder Wolf justified them. It was proved that a certain man named Whelock left his wife, and that she was afterward married to another man by Elder Wolf, her first husband (so far as known) still living, and he not even charged with fornication, and the parties so being married were held as members, but not allowed to occupy the office of deacon. Elder Wolf, also, with the counsel of eight members, baptized a woman by the name of Cheatersty, while living with a man who had another wife. Answer: We decide that both cases were absolutely adulterous, and that Elder Wolf did wrong in baptizing in the one case, and in celebrating the marriage in the other, and we require an acknowledgment of him, and of the eight members also, that gave counsel in the case, and exhort him and them to be more careful in the future.

Reason 3d: Elder Wolf also claims the Annual Meeting to be legislative, and refuses to be subject to its counsel. For the answer, see Art. No. 7.

Reason 4th: Being asked if he would commune with brethren when they wash feet in the double mode, said he could not conscientiously do so. Answer: In view of the position that Elder Wolf and his adherents occupy, as set forth in the allegation, that they will not wash feet in the double mode, we therefore, in order to give those who differ from them an opportunity to practice as their judgment and conscience dictate, are compelled to organize a church in California in the order of the general brotherhood, under the care and oversight of Elders Isaac Hershey and Michael Sissler, and ordain that the churches establish a line, and divide themselves as seems best to them, as we are not acquainted with the geography of the country as respects their several localities.

Reason 5th: They do not practice the kiss between the supper and the communion, nor read the Scriptures, nor speak of the sufferings of Christ, at that time, neither do they close with prayer at the close of the services on such occasions. Answer: We decide and exhort that they from henceforth adopt the practice of the general brotherhood in those things on such occasions.

Reason 6th: E. L. Prather, a minister, said the cause of the trouble here is, there are two parties of us; we are the Congregational party, the other the Annual Meeting party; we are governed by the word of God, the others by the elders of the Annual Meeting. He admits the charge, and makes the following acknowledgment by his signature:

"Required, that he acknowledge that his language, as used in the charge, reflects seriously upon the Annual Meeting, but as explained to mean congregational in a limited sense, which is accepted, provided he now acknowledges the supremacy of the Annual Meeting, and agrees to respect its counsels and co-operate with the general brotherhood, giving and taking counsel.

"Signed, E. L. PRATHER."

Reason 7th: Elders Wolf and Meyers stand charged for writing hard expressions in the "Gospel Trumpet." Charge sustained by the articles over their names; and we, the committee, decide that the language in said articles, when viewed literally, is very distasteful, and reflects seriously upon the dignity of the Annual Meeting, and demands acknowledgment at the hands of the authors. But as interpreted to mean congregational in a limited sense, which is accepted, provided they now acknowledge the supremacy of the Annual Meeting, and agree to respect its counsels, and co-operate with the general brotherhood in giving and in taking counsel, and also to withdraw their names and influence from said "Gospel Trumpet."

Reason 8th: They will not indorse the action of the committee sent by the Annual Meeting to Missouri, in 1872, but hold those denounced members in full fellowship. This charge not sustained by the evidence.

Reason 9th: That the church in California is in a bad state. Pride is tolerated too much. Even Elder Wolf has departed from the order of the brotherhood in simplicity of dress, and some sisters wearing hats, ribbons, veils, and other superfluities. Answer: That there is a departure from the order of the church in fashion and dress, is fully sustained by the evidence, and that Elder Wolf has not fully discharged his duty in suppressing and restraining pride, is also manifest. We therefore admonish and exhort him to exercise the functions of his office with the church in keeping order in this as well as other things.

Reason 10th: That Elder Wolf received and fellowshipped expelled members as brethren and officers in the church, after being informed that they were expelled by letters from the church from whnce they came, disregarding the letters, and received them because of their appearance, etc. Elder Wolf explained that the complaint is true in part, and that he was deceived by those men (Flory and Gibson) in part, and that he received them as a matter of courtesy, and not as brethren. Answer: Considered by us, that as these circumstances have transpired a long time since, and have been before the church time and again, that we dismiss them with a brotherly admonition, that Bro. Wolf erred in associating with these persons as he did, and exhort him in the future to adhere to the scriptural injunction to hold such as a heathen man and a publican, and in all cases respect the action of sister churches regarding the validity of their letters, etc., rather than the person of expelled members.

Reason 11th: That a deacon baptized in the presence of Elder Wolf. This allegation was sustained by the evidence, but explained by Bro. Broadherst, the deacon who officiated, that the duty of baptizing and celebrating marriage was voted upon him by the church, and given him in charge, when installed in office, to perform these duties when necessary, etc. Answer: With the above information before us, we thought best to dismiss the case.

Charges preferred by the brethren claiming to be the church of California, against certain persons among those refusing to hand in their letters, etc.:

Charge 1st: Against Elder Hershey, Peter Garman, and others, for organizing a church, and doing church business, within the limits of an organized branch. Answer: Not sustained by the evidence.

Charge 2d: Against Henry Haines, for saying he would not be satisfied until Elder Wolf's office was taken from him, and that the church would never prosper until it was done. Haines denies, and it is dismissed for want of evidence.

Charge 3d: Against Peter Garman, for attempting to read in public his letter, and those of several others, thereby causing hard feelings among the brethren, and much talk among the outside world. This was done after having an opportunity to read them the day before at church council. Confessed and explained. Answer: Considered, that it was out of order to read those letters before the public, but inasmuch as he was subject to the call to order by Elder Wolf, that we lay no further penalty upon him.

Charge 4th: Against Henry Haines, for visiting public saloons, and drinking therein. Considered, that upon hearing his explanation, we lay no further burden upon him than an admonition to him, and all others, to abstain from such appearance of evil, and that we show a better light to the world.

Charge 5th: Against Bro. Hoxie, for holding the idea of not praying at all in public, and other heretical doctrines, and preaching them publicly and privately. He admits the charge, but says, and also proved, that he has, and did very soon recant those doctrines, and acknowledges his wrong. Answer: We consider that the proceedings against him were informal, but as he was much out of order, we now require a frank acknowledgment of him.

The report, as above recorded, was read, re-read, and explained, then submitted, and was unanimously accepted by all the members present, and the requisitions complied with, and we having discharged the duty assigned us in the fear of God, according to our humble ability, submit all into the hands of that body from whom we receive our authority, for its approval or rejection, and into the hand of God, the Supreme Ruler of all events, praying that he may, and will, overrule all for the advancement of his cause, for the good of his children, and for the glory of his name. Respectfully submitted by your committee—H. D. Davy, B. F. Moomaw.

San Joaquin County, Cal., Nov. 2, 1874.

The above report was accepted by the Annual Meeting.

1877 ART. 10. Whereas, we deem fairness honorable in all cases, and feeling aggrieved at the way the question of feet-washing has been treated, we wish to know whether it is right for the Standing Committee to take queries that have been answered by district meetings, and change the answers, and then bring their answers before the meetings and put them on the minutes without being passed by the Annual Meeting? Answer: No; we think not.—This answer was given by the District Meeting. Then when the subject came before the Annual Meeting the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That as there is a charge against the Standing Committee, we appoint a committee to ascertain whether the charge is true.

A committee was appointed, and the following is its report, which was accepted and passed by Annual Meeting:

TO THE ANNUAL MEETING:—We, your committee appointed to investigate the above charge against the Standing Committee of last year, would say, that if the charge was sustained against said committee, it would be responsible for transcending its prerogatives; but inasmuch as the action taken, and answer given, was upon a query to which no answer was given by district meeting, we find that the charge is not fully sustained; and, whereas, it is claimed by the complainant that inasmuch as the promise was given by the Standing Committee through its chairman in 1875, that if they would bring their query in proper form to the next Annual Meeting, they should be heard, and then when so brought the committee of 1876 suppressed it with its answer, and put their own answer to a similar query upon the minutes which did not pass the meeting.

In this we find that the query in question, with its answer, was read before the meeting, and also the query which had no answer from the district meeting, with the answer of the Standing Committee, the whole matter was now brought before the meeting and freely discussed in the presence of the representatives of the complainant, whose right it was to have moved the consideration of their petition. The query and answer submitted by the Standing Committee failing to pass, it was decided to defer it. The answer, however, was put upon the minutes, which, in our judgment, was wrong, but for this wrong we find the clerk responsible, and not chargeable to the Standing Committee. B. F. Moomaw, Jacob Berkey, J. W. Brumbaugh.

1878 The committee appointed by the Annual Meeting of 1877 to visit and settle difficulties in the Upper Dublin Church, Pennsylvania, met said church in council on the 16th of August, 1877, and found serious troubles arising (principally) from the circumstances that members in the church belong to different secret societies. A charge to that effect was made, and the truth of the charge acknowledged by several. And, while several acknowledged the charge, we had plain evidence that the spirit of secretism, or that an idea favorable to secret societies, was too prevalent in the church. And knowing the popularity of secret societies in the world, and the growing tendency of this spirit if once tolerated in the church, we feel that the maintenance of a consistent course of conduct with our principles, and the purity of the church require a decided stand of the churches against secret societies. And though we found upon an examination of the case of secretism existing in the church, that there were some circumstances that were claimed to justify brethren belonging to secret societies, such as some of the officiating brethren in receiving members, admitted them on certain conditions, requiring of them no more than absenting of themselves from the public parading of such societies in their regalia, and allowing them to pay their dues and to receive what they are entitled to, according to the rules of said societies. But if some brethren, and even elders, have showed a disposition to tolerate to some extent members in the church who belong to secret societies, we, the committee considering the case bearing upon the general brotherhood, and the future of the brotherhood, feel it to be our duty to require of all those belonging to all secret societies, and among them the **Order of Mechanics**, a complete withdrawal from all connection with them, or they can not be held as members of the church, according to II. Corinthians vi. 14-18; John xviii. 20; Ephesians iv. 10-12.

There was also a charge that some members, after promising to abide the decisions of a certain committee called to settle difficulties in the church, became dissatisfied with said decision. Though we think, the brethren alluded to in the charge, should have considered the matter more fully before they accepted the report; yet looking at the whole subject, and hearing their reasons, we decide that under the circumstances, they are not to be censured.

The charge against Brother John Slingluff, for inconsistency, we consider was not sustained by sufficient evidence.

The foregoing report being submitted to the church, was rejected by the majority of the church. James Quinter, Wm. Hartzler, Samuel Harley, Henry Cassel, committee.

1879 ART. 1. As a committee has been appointed by the Annual Council of 1878 to devise a way to more effectually reduce or prevent the assembling of a mixed multitude, and for the carrying out more fully of the plan of 1866, and to report to the present meeting the result of their labors. This being unfinished or deferred business, it was the first in order to be acted upon, and accordingly the committee made the following report: The committee appointed by the Annual Meeting of 1878 for preparing and presenting to the Annual Meeting of 1879, some plan for holding the Annual Meeting by which that adopted in 1866 may be more fully carried out, and the mixed multitude reduced, met at the house of Brother Christian Wine on the 30th of May, 1879, in Rockingham County, Virginia, and, upon a prayerful deliberation of the work committed to us, have concluded to submit the following suggestions to this Annual Meeting: **First.** Inasmuch as there has been some difficulty in holding our Annual Meeting because of the amount of funds required to hold it, to obviate this difficulty, we recommend that each brother that attends the meeting shall pay one dollar; and though the sisters have nothing laid upon them, it is to be understood that they may do as they think proper in contributing to the support of the meeting. **Second.** We recommend that none but the brethren and sisters, and their special friends, shall receive their boarding in the general boarding tent; but that a tent, or if necessary or desirable more than one, be erected by reliable persons for accommodating such as are not members of the church with suitable boarding, and at a moderate price. And that this may be done, we recommend that the brethren have the oversight of all the boarding arrangements, and to fix them as will be most satisfactory to the church and to those for whose accommodations they are designed. **Third.** In order that a proper distinction may be made between such as are members and such as are not, we recommend that the members be furnished with tickets. These tickets shall be furnished by the proper authority at the place at which the meeting is to be held; and each church shall obtain from that authority as many tickets as shall be wanted by members going to Annual Meeting from that church. **Fourth.** The members of the church in which the meeting is held shall be exonerated from paying the amount that the others shall pay, and the committee of arrangements shall decide who are entitled to exoneration besides the congregation in which the meeting is held, for services rendered. **Fifth.** We recommend that the committee of arrangements acting for the church in which the meeting is held, shall decide whether there shall be any preaching at the place of meeting. **Sixth.** We recommend that good arrangements be made for the Standing Committee and delegates, and that the tent for holding the council be no larger than will contain as many as can hear what is spoken. We also recommend that it be a sufficient distance from the boarding tent, that the council may not be annoyed by any noise. We also suggest the propriety of so arranging the council tent that the seats may be elevated from the center; but the seats only, and not the platform for the Standing Commitee and delegates. We further recommend that in making the boarding tent there be an aisle through the whole length of the tent, separating the brethren from the sisters; and that the tables run from the aisle to the sides of the tent, and that there be a door in the side of the tent to each table for admitting the brethren on one side and the sisters on the other. All of which is respectfully submitted. R. H. Miller, J. Quinter, D. Brower, E. Eby, S. Garber. The above report was accepted by the council.

1880 ART. 3. A request from the Western District of Pennsylvania to call up and protect the petition of that district sent up to the Annual Meeting of 1879, urging the work of evangelism upon said meeting, and instructing the delegates to use all fair means to have the Annual Meeting to accept and encourage said work, but which was deferred by the Annual Meeting of 1879. Upon the presentation of the above request, the following resolution was offered and passed by the Annual Meeting:

Resolved, That we appoint a committee of five, whose duty it shall be to present a plan that will harmonize with other plans that have been favored by Annual Meeting, and the one now in operation among us; but Annual Meeting shall not be financially responsible for any plan.

The committee reported the following plan, which was adopted by the Annual Meeting: 1. We recommend this Annual Meeting to appoint five brethren, sound in the faith and fully alive to our missionary interests, to superintend the domestic and foreign missionary work of the general brotherhood. 2. That these five brethren appoint out of their number such officers (corresponding secretary, treasurer, etc.,) as the nature of the work requires. 3. That the brethren be instructed to interfere in no way with any present individual church or district missionary efforts among our brethren. 4. That Annual Meeting advise that any domestic or foreign mission-work of a general nature, like the Danish Mission, now under the care of district council, be committed to the supervision of this Board. 5. That this meeting recommend that the fund now in the hands of the "Brethren's Work of Evangelism," be committed to the treasury of the board of the General Conference. 6. That this Board be instructed to proceed no further in its appointments, etc., than the means of the treasury justify. 7. That the officers of this Board be required to make an official report of their work, its condition, operation, and wants, to each session of our General Conference, and that said report go into our regular minutes. 8. That every church in the brotherhood be requested to appoint a solicitor in its own congregation to raise funds for this work, and forward the same to the treasurer of this mission board at least every six months. 9. That this Board be instructed to proceed to its work at once, as opportunity permits. 10. That the Standing Committee of Annual Meeting be required to fill any vacancy that may occur in the Board from time to time, and that its members be elected every four years. J. W. Stein, John Metzger, Hiel Hamilton, J. D. Livengood, J. W. Fitzgerald, committee. In connection with the foregoing, the following resolution was passed:

Resolved that the Danish Mission be transferred to the Domestic and Foreign Mission Board.

1880 ART. 12. What is to be required of official brethren and others who signed and took an active part in circulating a petition asking Annual Meeting to come back to the time when there were no series of meetings, no Sabbath schools, no supper on the table at feet-washing, salaried ministry, colleges, nor single mode of feet-washing? Such petitions purporting to have been authorized by a council of elders held in Miami Valley, Ohio, November, 1879, and said elders denying the same. Such petitions have caused much hard feeling and disturbance in their mutinous and schismatic effects.

There were several papers of the same character before the meeting, and a resolution was passed by the meeting to appoint a committee of five to prepare something upon the subject for the General Council. Said committee made the following report, which was accepted by the council:

We, your committee, after carefully investigating the matter before us, in the fear of the Lord, decide that the two elders, namely, David Y. Miller and Jacob Metzger, should be relieved of the office of eldership and make an acknowledgment to the church; and Harrison Rule also to be relieved of his office, and should make an acknowledgment to the satisfaction of the church, as it is evident they got up the petitions themselves, and represented them as coming from the Miami Valley, Ohio, thereby deceiving those who signed them, which has caused a great deal of trouble and dissatisfaction; hence upon the ground of this deception and falsehood we base the foregoing decisions. And we further decide that those who circulated these petitions shall make satisfactory acknowledgment. We also further decide that those who signed the petition be admonished to be careful in signing petitions that may affect the peace and union of the church. Jacob Rife, D. B. Sturgis, George Holler, John P. Wolf, D. E. Price, committee.

Upon the acceptance of the foregoing report, the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That the Standing Committee appoint a committee to go to the congregation referred to in the report, to carry out the decision of Annual Meeting. And if, after investigating the matter, the parties charged are found innocent, the committee will act accordingly. And if they are found guilty, may relieve them of their office.

The committee appointed by the Annual Meeting of 1879 to visit and settle difficulties in eastern Maryland, succeeded in its labors in all the churches but one. The following part of its report refers to unsettled difficulties, and it was presented to the Annual Meeting and accepted.

And in regard to the second committee, composed of the three following elders, namely: Isaac Pfoutz, D. K. Sayler, A. H. Senseney, and the two following brethren in the second degree of the ministry, namely, Jesse Roop and Henry Sayler, whom they constituted elders in trying the proceedings of the former committee, we found, first, that they were not adjoining elders. Second, that they were not called by the church. Third, that they did not notify the parties opposed to D. Gibbon. Fourth, they did not give any notice to the committee whose work they designed to investigate. Fifth, they gave no public or general notice to the church of their meeting, and went on and tried the case in the absence of all the parties interested but D. Gibbon and his friends. And though they have rejected us as a committee, we decide that they make satisfaction to the former committee, and those who brought charges against D. Gibbon. And if they do not, we recommend that the Annual Meeting send a committee here to enforce submission to its authority.

The committee sent a request to the oldest elder in the Beaver Dam Church, to appoint a council meeting for the further investigation of the troubles in the churches in eastern Maryland. And though the elder in his reply to us gave us to understand that he would ascertain from his church whether a council would be called, it appeared that he did not consult the church, but that a council was refused us upon the authority of the official members, without the church being informed of our wish, or being consulted. And in view of the fact that we were refused a council in said church, and as we found a great want of love and union among the brethren of eastern Maryland, we recommend the Annual Meeting of 1880 to send a committee there with full authority to set in order the things that are wanting. R. H. Miller, James Quinter, William Hertzler, C. G. Lint, Daniel Keller, committee.

1881 ART. 4. The following papers came from different parts of the brotherhood, and were, by action of the council, submitted to a committee of brethren to report upon them: "Inasmuch as Brother H. R. Holsinger has been admonished by the Annual Meeting again and again, according to the minutes of Annual Meeting, to cease to publish articles conflicting with the general order of the **old** brethren and good feeling of the church, and still continues to do the same, we now request Annual Meeting to deal with him according to Matthew xviii, and the decision of Annual Meeting, either directly or by a committee, and if he does not hear the church, hold him as a heathen man and a publican. Is it right for brethren to publish papers like the **Progressive Christian** and **Vindicator,** creating and fostering strife by publishing articles against the established order of the church, and if not right, what is to be done with brethren who publish such a paper or papers?" Answer: Not right for brethren to publish such a paper or papers, and any brother or brethren that publish such a paper or papers shall make an humble acknowledgment for so doing, and promise not to publish such articles any more in the future, said acknowledgment and agreement to be published in their paper or papers.

Is district meeting favorable towards calling the attention of Annual Meeting to the character of the paper called **Progressive Christian,** and require Brother Holsinger, its present editor, to cease publishing articles of criticism on Annual Meeting, its decisions, and its work among the churches through its organized committee, and cease publishing his own articles, or those of others advocating measures calculated to subvert the principles and rules of order in our brotherhood in matters of plainness of dress, and against the exercise of the expelling power of refractory members, and if he refuse so to promise, should not Annual Meeting declare such publication contrary to the best interest of the church of Christ, and provide accordingly? Answer: This district meeting requests Annual Meeting to decide that the **Progressive Christian** and all like papers, purporting to be published by a member or members of the Brethren Church, do not reflect the spirit and principles of the church of Christ. The policy pursued by such papers is in direct opposition to the principles enunciated in Titus iii. 1.; 1 Peter v. 5; James iv. 11, and I. Peter xi. 11. Editors and contributors who violate these principles of the gospel, subject themselves to arraignment and trial before the congregation where they reside, or before Annual Meeting. We further request Annual Meeting to require our editors to conduct their respective papers according to Romans xiv. 19, and Ephesians iv. 29, so that the body be edified, strengthened, and unified in love and holiness. We also look with sorrow upon the tendency to levity and jesting through the papers, and beseech writers and teachers to avoid the degrading habit, and remember I. Thessalonians v. 6-8; Ephesians v. 4, and iv. 29; Titus ii. 2-12; I. Peter i: 13; iv. 7; v. 8. And we further desire that Annual Meeting require Brother H. R. Hoslinger to make confession for having violated the word of God in the manner in which he has conducted his paper.

WHEREAS H. R. Holsinger is publishing articles in his paper which have a tendency to bring about discord among the brethren, and has a bad influence outside of the brotherhood, we request, therefore, that a committee be appointed whose duty it shall be to take notice of that paper, and if articles will continue to appear contrary to the faith and practice of the church, that it shall be their duty to bring said Brother Holsinger to an account, as in their judgment they may deem proper and right. Answer: This meeting asks the Annual Meeting to grant and appoint the committee herein asked for, that it may carry out the decisions of 1879, Article 16.

WHEREAS, H. R. Holsinger, editor of the **Progressive Christian,** is publishing and circulating through his paper, and by tracts, unchristian, and often untruthful reflections upon brethren, made either by such who were subjected to their local church discipline, or by such who withstand and resist parts of our general and recognized church order; and also publicly through his paper charges brethren with being untruthful, in violation of the gospel rule (Matt. xviii. 16.) And, whereas, the tendency of such publications is to encourage disorder and misrule among the churches, affecting the pace and prosperity of local churches, and likewise the harmony of our General Conference; and, whereas, the church of the Southern Missouri District unite their efforts with all the churches of our general brotherhood towards preserving the principles and the precepts of the gospel as embodied in our long-established and general recognized rules and order of church fellowship. Will, therefore, district meeting consider it advisable to declare whether H. R. Holsinger, or others, can be held and recognized by us as a brother, conducting a paper of the character of the **Progressive Christian,** now edited by H. R. Holsinger, and to declare whether in its conducting a paper of the character of the **Progressive Christian,** now edited by H. R. Holsinger, and to declare whether in its judgment he can of right and with propriety be accepted to assist in general church work, or to serve on the Standing Committee. Answer: We view with fear the course pursued by H. R. Holsinger, in the manner of conducting his paper, and of the principle he advocates, and we are unanimous in the conviction that it should be declared that we can not regard him as a brother, and that he should be excluded from all participation in general church work, and we place these, our convictions, in the hands of the Standing Committee, to act in the premises as to them appears to be necessary.

The committee to which the above papers were submitted, made the following reports, which were passed by the meeting: We, the undersigned, members of the committee appointed to consider charges against H. R. Holsinger and Samuel Kinsey, find that H. R. Holsinger is publishing a paper in which many articles have appeared criticizing the work of Annual Meeting, and against the order of our church government, as also against our order of observing the gospel principle of non-conformity to the world in wearing apparel, after having been again and again admonished by our Annual Meeting to be more guarded in his publication, and promised to do so, which promise he has not performed, but has continued his former course with increased effort. We therefore recommend that this meeting appoint a committee to wait on him in his church, and deal with him according to his transgressions. S. S. Mohler, Daniel Vaniman, D. E. Price, George W. Cripe, Abraham Miller, Joel Neff, C. Bucher, John Brillhart, John Smith.

In reference to the complaint alleged against Brother Samuel Kinsey, editor of the **Vindicator,** we find he has not used due caution against admitting articles into his paper having a schismatic tendency, and criticizing the work of committees, etc., (see volumes XI. and XII.), and we recommend a commitee to be appointed to wait on him in his church, and deal with him as his case demands. S. S. Mohler, C. Bucher, G. W. Cripe, John Smith, Daniel Vaniman, John Brillhart, D. E. Price, Abraham Miller, Joel **Neff.**

1881 ART. 5. The following papers, having reference to our periodicals, were also submitted to a committee to report on them to the council:

Inasmuch as the Brethren have always and wisely opposed paid or salaried ministry, because of its corrupting effects upon the church, and inasmuch as the periodicals conducted by our brethren under the present system are exposed to the same corrupting influence; and also because of the present growing difficulties in the brotherhood, which must largely be attributed to the present number and system of conducting our papers, we therefore recommend to the serious consideration of this district meeting the propriety of preparing and recommending to Annual Meeting one system for the conducting of a single paper, to be under the supervision of the brotherhood. With this view to concentrate the responsibility into a board of managers, whose duty it shall be to see that they are conducted in harmony with the spirit and tenor of the gospel.

On motion, the delegates selected a committee on publications, and on the morning of the 18th the committee reported as follows, which report, after some debate, was accepted and forwarded to Annual Meeting:

We, the undersigned brethren, having been appointed by the present district meeting to take into consideration the accompanying recommendation, have, after due and prayerful thought, come to the following conclusions, which we herewith present to the district meeting now in session, for its acceptance or rejection:

WHEREAS, The present manner of conducting the many papers now in the brotherhood, is having an injurious effect upon the church, therefore we ask Annual Meeting to appoint a committee to see what can be done toward consolidating the papers, and report to next Annual Meeting a plan by which such consolidation may be effected. And we further recommend that a committee be appointed to call to account—if not done by the church in which they live—all editors who shall allow such objectionable articles that may cause dissensions or strife, and especially of a personal character, by referring to reports of committees or in any way causing hard feeling. Enoch Eby, John J. Emmert, Daniel Deardorff, J. C. Lehman, Edmond Forney, David E. Price, George D. Zollars, D. L. Miller. We ask district meeting to enact something that will reduce the superfluous number of periodicals now published in the brotherhood, and thus suppress and avoid the useless and injurious controversies that occur by reason of said superfluity.

The committee to which the above papers were submitted, made the following report, which was passed by the council:

We, your undersigned committee, have prayerfully considered the petition you presented us, and in our humble judgment decide,

1. That the present unhappy state of things among us is not occasioned by the number of papers published among us, but by the character of the matter contained in them. We decide,

2. That the publication of a periodical is a private enterprise, and, if properly conducted, is an important auxiliary in disseminating truth, and as such this meeting has no right to prohibit their publication. We decide,

3. That editors, like those who pursue other occupations, are equally responsible to the church for their conduct and influence. Now, whereas there are many grave objections coming to this meeting raised against the offensive character of articles published in some of our papers, and whereas these editors, or some of them, have been admonished time and again, made promise after promise, and violated them, we therefore, as your

committee, recommend that when editors fail to make satisfaction for the offense they thus commit, that Annual Meeting shall take the matter into consideration and send a committee to wait upon said editors in their own congregations. I. J. Rosenberger, Solomon Buckalew, George Holler, John Flory, Joseph Bowman.

Committee Expenses

The undersigned reported to the meeting that he had in his possession a balance of about one hundred dollars of the money collected to defray expenses of the committee to California, and was directed to retain it until Annual Meeting shall have occasion to use it in paying the expenses of some other committee. J. QUINTER

1883 First, Report of Hymn-book Committee:

We, your Committee on Hymn-book, appointed by the last Yearly Meeting, have executed the work to the best of our ability. We find that some slight errors in the work remained unnoticed, which, however, will be corrected in the future editions. Donations have been received sufficient to cover cost of typesetting and electrotyping, with a small amount remaining on hand. We now humbly submit the work this Yearly Meeting, with the hope it will give it an expression of approval, and also say what disposition we shall make of the funds remaining, and into whose care the plates shall be given. S. Kinsey, A. Frantz, H. P. Wherley, E. Miller, J. Kimmel. Answer: This meeting accepts the report of the committee in relation to the hymn books and the promised corrections, and directs that the surplus money remaining be applied toward defraying the expenses of printing the pamphlets containing the "**Reasons**" for adopting the resolutions, and recommends that the plates be placed under the care of Brother S. Kinsey.

Second, Report of Pamphlet Committee on Printing:

We, the brethren appointed by the elders who met at the house of Brother John Kimmel to collect and put up in pamphlet form all the petitions, etc., that were from time to time presented to the Annual Meeting, praying for a coming back to our former order and practice, desire to say that we have complied with said request, and the work is now nearly ready to be sent out. In producing this work we found that we would be obliged to make it fully as large again as we had at first expected to do, so as to render the information desired and needed. This necessarily increased the expenses accordingly. The cost of printing ten thousand pamphlets of fifty-three pages each, binding, postage, mailing, etc., will be about $380. The donations received amount to $177, leaving a balance of $203 wanting. Now, inasmuch as it was at first proposed and announced to send these books out free to the ministers of the general brotherhood and all those desiring them, but as the funds donated are so far short of the expenses, we desire the advice of this meeting as to what course we shall now take in the case. Samuel Murray, George V. Siler, Samuel Kinsey. Answer: We recommend that all the elders and ministers of the brotherhood, on their return home, lay this matter before their churches, and try to raise by donations the sum wanted, so that the pamphlet may be sent free to all. Let the churches do this at once, and when they forward their contributions they can order the number of copies they desire.

Third, Report of the Committee on Revision of Minutes:

There is nothing in this world which is of so much worth to us as "the church of God, the ground and pillar of the truth;" hence the Savior invites us all to come unto it, saying: "The time is fulfilled, the kingdom of heaven is at hand, repent and believe the gospel." But while Jesus thus calls to us and importunes us to piety and purity of life, Satan is also busily engaged in mixing the truth with errors, sowing tares with the wheat, thereby deceiving and corrupting the hearts of many by seducing them to believe that in their profession of faith in Christ they are also to make provision for the lust of the flesh, the eyes, and the pride of life, and the honors of the world, and thus escape the most of the persecutions which all are partakers of who will live godly in Christ Jesus in this present evil world. Such seducing spirits having crept unawares into the fellowship of the "Old German Baptist," or Old Brethren Church, and became instrumental in her councils in introducing into practice the above evils alluded to, with unscriptural diversity in practicing the ordinances of God's house, thus causing divisions contrary to the doctrine of Christ and His apostles, whereupon the brethren and sisters of the primitive faith and order sent queries and petitions up to the Annual Meeting to no longer continue granting such unscriptural liberty. But neither prayers, queries, nor petitiions, sent in love, with years of forbearance, long-suffering, and patience, would secure the sanction of said Annual Meeting to return to primitive practice and unity of the spirit and order of the faith of the Son of God; hence their only alternative was to do as the Apostle Paul taught in his second letter to the Thessalonians (3:6); also to Timothy (6:5; Romans 16: 17)—"From such withdraw thyself"—which withdrawal was consummated by the act of the council of the old order members assembled from various states (by announcement of the elders of the Miami Valley, Ohio) on the 24th day of August, A. D. 1881, near Arcanum, Darke County, Ohio, and afterward accepted by the old order members of Beaver Dam, Pipe Creek, and Middletown Valley churches in the State of Maryland, and of the Falling Springs Church, near Waynesboro, Franklin County, Pennsylvania. All of the old order members of the last-mentioned churches and states having already previously withdrawn in 1880, by refusing any longer to receive or submit to the usurpation of councils of this modern Annual Meeting work, therefore it becomes a necessity for a revision of the latter part of the Book of Minutes of the Annual Meeting, or so far back as to where this unscriptural usurpation and liberalism was contracted and controlled in her decisions, for truly decisions of the last few years were made to hold together as one which God never united into one fellowship of faith upon earth, because said decisions conflict, being contradictory and in opposition to the truth, and are unintelligible and irreconcilable to each other. So the work of revision becomes a solemn necessity, to throw out and make void all answers to queries and councils of the above-mentioned type or character. This book contains the acknowledged councils of the Annual Meeting of the Old German Baptist, or Brethren, Church. In accordance with these facts the meeting of the last Annual Meeting, held May 29, 1882, in the Wolf Creek Church, Montgomery County, Ohio, a committee of seven elders were appointed to compose a committee of revision; namely, G. V. Siler, A. H. Sensney, Jacob Metzger, John Harshey, Samuel Musselman, Joseph Cripe, Samuel Murray. Said committee, under the blessing of God, met May 11, 1883, at Flora, Carrol County, Indiana, and in peace and love and union began the work assigned them. After mature reflection it was mutually agreed to say that in a plain and simple way we hold all the minutes of said book in full faith and practice, whose decisions are in perfect harmony with the ancient established order of the brethren, who were offered up in support to the unity of the doctrine and practice, as will be understood; namely, that the Miami elders' petition, of the Southern District of Ohio, in the year of 1880, sent up to the Annual Meeting of 1880, contains the proper claims upon the general brotherhood for a return to the old established order of faith and practice. The resolutions of August 24, 1881, contain the declaration of these innovations from which we abstain. Therefore, we are disposed to take up those minutes found in error, or so indefinite as to have caused trouble. We indorse and adhere to all which contain facts of the faith so set forth in both petition and resolutions cited, and strictly approve of the good and proper, and disapprove of those in error, whether answers or decisions.

1884 The committee authorized by last Yearly Meeting to continue to reconsider the former minutes of Yearly Meetings, then composed of the following named brethren, namely: G. V. Siler, of Ohio, John Hershey, of Missouri, Joseph I. Cover, of Ohio, Joseph Cripe, of Illinois, Samuel Murray, of Ohio, Jacob Metzgar (now deceased).

The above-named committee were expected to meet previous to the Yearly Meeting held at Beaver Dam, Maryland, for the year 1884, and to continue the labor of reconsidering the book of minutes in order to complete the same. But under the blessings of God not all the committee were permitted to meet together, circumstances preventing. Brother Samuel Musselman and Brother Jos. Cripe each wrote letters of their inability to attend. Brother Joseph Cripe, by letter, selected Brother Aaron Frantz, of Ohio, to take his place. Brother Samuel Musselman, of Iowa (Now Nebraska), gave liberty for the committee to select one to fill his place, which selection was Brother H. D. Davy, of Ohio. Our deceased brother, Jacob Metzger, by reason of death, left the committee to make another choice, which fell upon Elder Daniel Brower, of Ohio.

The committee now being full proceeded prayerfully to reconsider the remaining part of the book of minutes in the fear of the Lord, as God may give us grace.

DEFERRED MATTER OF 1884

Report of the Committee on the Re-publication of the Annual Meeting "Minute Book"

1885 ART. 1. We, your committee appointed last year at the Yearly Meeting, held at Beaver Dam Church, Carroll County, Maryland, for the re-publishing of the Book of the Minutes of the Annual Meeting, do state that we made frequent inquiries for the stereotype plates of said book, commencing in the month of August, 1884; and after the fourth inquiry, and search was made in the rooms of the "Christian Publishing House," Dayton, Ohio, the stereotype plates were found to be in tolerably good condition. Three were fractured, two damaged, and some five or six supposed to be missing. But owing to the fact that there was a joint partnership existing with the former publishers (Elders H. D. Davy and James Quinter) of the first edition of the book, 1876; and further, also, from the fact that these two brethren, as publishers, now stand identified in two distinct and separate organizations, having respectively and conventionally adopted ecclesiastical names, indicative of the peculiarity of their faith and church policy, as has been entered upon the minutes of the Old German Baptist Church for the year 1883 [see minutes of Wolf Creek meeting, May 29-31, 1883, Section 20, revised minutes], and upon the other part by Annual Meeting of 1883, has been entered upon their minutes the appellation of "The German Baptists," [see minutes of 1883, Bismarck], to which Elder James Quinter holds his membership. Consequently, as there was not that reciprocal feeling manifested towards the Old German Baptist brethren that formerly was accorded them, on account of the same doctrine, rule of government, faith, and practice, in a peaceful fellowship, we, your committee, could not proceed to publish the book assigned to us until the following difficulties were obviated:

First, Its copyright being in two proprietories, of diverse and singular control now in these two representatives of the two organizations whose interests would have to be consolidated by amicable consent, or by purchase or sale of the said right unto one or the other in agreement, but recently has resulted in Elder James Quinter selling all his right, title and interest, and claim, whatsoever, by conveyance from him and for them unto **us,** and **in behalf of you,** as an organization of the other part, before we could legally effect the bringing of the book (in question) before this meeting, as you desired. But we are now prepared to make you the following statement: Brother H. D. Davy has succeeded, by letters written by the other members of your committee, to have and to hold all the property in full, partly once the property of Elder James Quinter, for the sum of fifty dollars, fully paid by him, as per receipt of contract and assignment, dated March 3d, A. D. 1885, and set in his own hand and seal, and acknowledged the same in accordance to the law of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which see deed (A).

Secondly, Bro. H. D. Davy is out of and back, from the former publication about $350, namely, stationery, postage, labor in preparing the minutes, loss by agents, and cost of copyright and stereotypes, etc, which he now offers to sell and convey unto the Old German Baptist Church, all his right, title, interest, and claim whatsoever, for the sum of $300, dropping fifty dollars in good will to the church, and making a clear title and assignment to the ordained elders of the Old German Baptist Church, and to their successors in office forever; they giving, through their authorized agents, an approved note for the term of three years, with interest at six per cent, from date of contract, interest paid annually, or at which time they shall have received a guarantee subscription or funds, in the hands of the churches, or **from the cash sale of the book to cover note,** etc.

Thirdly, This claim and title covers the publication of the Book of Minutes of the Annual Meeting from the year 1778 to 1876, inclusive.

Fourthly, Brother H. D. Davy now being a party of the purchase and sale, his ability to act in this matter by the disposition of his own will voluntarily, while in said committee, ceases, and we further pray relief, or further instruction to complete the work assigned us.

H. D. Davy, Sam'l Murray, and Jos. I. Cover, committee.

COMMENDATORY.—From the Standing Committee

We recommend to this meeting that this business be continued and go on with the publishing of the book of "The Minutes of Annual Meeting," at an early day; and therefore, it now becomes necessary for this meeting to appoint two brethren competent to transact this business legally, according to the order of the Brethren, and for the church above named, and who shall have authority to act as the **Agents** of the Ordained Elders of the Old German Baptist Church, and thus transact the business in the contract now to be made, and to act in behalf of the church at large, to give note, sign it in behalf of the ordained elders of the church, and pay off the note, to receive the title and hold it in good faith from the said H. D. Davy, to publish the said book in a durable form, to take subscriptions for it, collect in the same and all moneys accruing therefrom, and also to sell the same or anything pertaining thereto. Last, we suggest the appointment of Brothers Samuel Murray and Joseph I Cover as corporate agents to carry out the furtherance of this noble work and publish the old book purchased from Bro. H. D. Davy, and with it the succeeding minutes from 1876 to this present meeting. Subject to the approval of this meeting.

Approved by the meeting, with the understanding that subsequent minutes be also controlled by the copyright.

Signed in behalf of the Standing Committee: Abraham Flory, foreman; Aaron Frantz, reading clerk; Samuel Murray, assistant; Joseph I. Cover, clerk.

Report of the Hymn-book Committee upon the German Hymn-book.

1885 ART. 2. We, your committee, report that five hundred copies have been printed and are ready for sale.

The cost of said number of copies		$115.00
Repairs, electrotyping German		1.00
Setting and electrotyping English advertisement		1.75
Incidental preparatory expenses—additional		5.75
		$123.50
Amount subscribed	$97.80	
Amount unpaid	12.60	
	$85.20	
Amount of cash paid, as per receipt		$100.00
		$ 23.50

Balance due committee on all costs, $23.50, up to date, May 26, 1885.

Report of Tent Committee

Aaron Frantz, Henry P. Wehrley, Emanuel Miller, John Kimmel, Joseph I. Cover, committee. Answer: This meeting recommends that Bro. Cover pay the balance of the cost of printer's bill as agreed upon (June 1, 1885), and we advise the friends of the German hymn-book, who want them or have not paid their subscription, to send for them at once, accompanying their order with the amount, and diminish the debt.

1909 ART. 7. We, the undersigned committee appointed by the Yearly Meeting of 1908, to purchase tents for the purpose of holding Yearly Meetings in, make the following report to the Yearly Meeting of 1909: The committee met for consultation November the 14th, 1908, at the home of Brother Frank Petry, the committee all being present except Brother J. H. Balsbaugh, he being sick at that time and not able to come. After full consideration of all bids given by the different tent manufacturers, we agreed to place our order for the tents with the Jones Hardware Co., of Richmond, Indiana, for the tents at their price, which is $950, F. O. B. Toledo, Ohio.

The committee not being instructed how to raise the funds with which to pay for the tents, we agreed to solicit the whole brotherhood. By this plan we received the amount that will be reported in the treasurer's report. We, your committee, propose to build or purchase two trucks, with suitable boxes, in which to store the tents for shipment and preservation, which will probably cost about $75.00 each.

Report of Treasurer to Yearly Meeting of 1909

We, the tent committee, have appropriated $1,400.00 to the General Brotherhood for purchasing Yearly Meeting tents and caring for same, with other expense, as may be needed.

Appropriations to be raised by Eastern Districts		$200.00	
Raised and Paid in			$145.40
Yet unraised	$ 54.60		
For Ohio		525.00	
Raised and paid in			535.25
For Indiana		475.00	
Raised and paid in			254.80
Yet unraised	220.20		
For Western District		200.00	
Raised and paid in			210.30
Total amount paid in			$1145.75
Paid out for tents		950.00	
Paid for traveling expenses and postage		183.62	
Total paid out		$1133.62	
Balance on hand			12.13
Appropriation not yet raised	274.80		

Signed by order of committee.

FRANK PETRY, Treas.

We, your tent committee, suggest that the tents be cared for in the locality where the meeting is held, until the next meeting is located, then the tents can be shipped to where the next meeting is to be held. We may be able to have a proper storage for them by that time.

And further, we think some of the small articles that are used each year at the meeting, such as water spigots, etc., should be held by the brotherhood and shipped from place to place with the tent fixtures. Isaac P. Stitely, J. D. Mohler, Moses Plunkett, Frank Petry.

We, the standing committee, agree to accept the tent committee's report, and forward same to this Yearly Meeting for their consideration; and in view of Brother Henry Balsbaugh's affliction, on account of which he asks to be relieved, suggest that his request be complied with and another be appointed in his stead, and this standing committee suggests that D. D. Skiles, of Indiana, be appointed in his stead.

The Yearly Meeting accepts tent committee's report, with this understanding, that should there be any dissatisfaction in the appropriation made by the committee, it be arranged with the dissatisfied, if any.

The Tent Committee

1910 We, the members of the tent committee, having performed the duties laid upon us by Yearly Meeting in arranging for the purchasing and caring for of tents for Yearly Meeting use having performed that duty hereby ask to be relieved. Isaac P. Stitely, J. D. Mohler, Frank Petry, D. D. Skiles.

This standing committee respects the request of the tent committee by relieving the elders and ministers of said committee and retaining the others, and suggests that there be three brethren appointed in each district in their stead to care for tents hereafter, namely:

Eastern District: Jacob Diehl, Union Bridge, Maryland; H. G. Benedict, Mont Alto, Pennsylvania; John Jamison, Hollins, Virginia.

Ohio District: Frank Petry, Eldorado, Ohio; D. F. Denlinger, Trotwood, Ohio; E. E. Hyre, R. F. D. No. 10, Dayton, Ohio.

Indiana District: D. D. Skiles, Rossville, Indiana; Stephen Cripe, Peru, Indiana; Solomon Hay, Sidney, Indiana.

Western District: John H. Armstrong, Westphalia, Kansas; Riley Barnhart, Pomona, Kansas; Samuel Churchbaugh, Baldwin, Kansas.

Passed by the meeting.

Report of Yearly Meeting Tent Committee

Paid for two tents	$950.00	
Paid for water spigots	10.65	
Paid for mailing stamps	2.20	
Paid for tent repairs	4.58	
Total		$967.43
Paid for railroad fare		205.72
Paid for material for tent trucks	166.64	
Paid for labor to make trucks	63.75	

Paid for padlocks	3.40	
Total cost of tent trucks		233.79
Paid for freight on trucks	13.44	
Paid for gas pipe, ropes, etc.	20.74	
Paid for blacksmithing	5.00	
Paid for wall poles, stakes, etc.	1.80	
		40.98
Total paid out		$1447.92
Total receipts from different districts		1422.28
Treasury Dr. to		$25.64

Submitted to standing committee.

FRANK PETRY, Treasurer.

Report accepted by the meeting.

Report of Tent Committee's Treasury

1911 At Yearly Meeting of 1910, Treasury was Dr. to	$25.64	
Cash receipts since Yearly Meeting of 1910 from different parts of Ohio		$60.45
Less indebtedness		25.64
Balance in Treasury to date, June 5, 1911		34.81

Submitted FRANK PETRY, Treasurer.

The tent committee was advised and duly empowered to investigate and decide upon some kind of dressing for the Yearly Meeting tents and to apply the same, to render them a better protection against rain.

Report of Vindicator Committee

1916 To Standing Committee and Annual Meeting, Greeting:

Inasmuch as Annual Meeting of 1894 has empowered the Vindicator committee to fill vacancies, change editors, and take full charge of the work to the best interest of the cause of Christ and the church, subject to Annual Meeting, we desire to say that two of the committee, viz: Brother William Cassell and Brother A. Frantz having departed this life, and Brother A. Hyre being much afflicted and unable to assist in the work, the committee chose Brother I. H. Cool as a member of the staff; and if the brotherhood still feels satisfied with the brethren in their work, they feel to add one or two more in the near future. We, the committee, desire to make this report to Annual Meeting of 1916, subject to her approval and counsel.

Henry Garber, B. A. Frantz, Jonathan Wenrick, J. D. Mohler.
Report approved.

Report of Committee Sent to Ohio by Y. M. of 1917

Eaton, Ohio, August 22nd, 1917

1918 We the undersigned, as a committee sent by Annual Meeting of 1917, to investigate and adjust difficulties existing in the Donnels Creek and Upper and Lower Twin churches in Ohio, and elsewhere effected originating from the course of procedure on the auto advices, after investigating the troubles as best we could in said churches, when we met to deliberate and formulate a report of our labors we found we were divided on the understanding of the auto advices to such an extent that we in unison decided it was not safe for us to attempt to formulate decisions on so grave a matter affecting not only these churches but many others throughout our brotherhood.

For the above reasons we thus report to said churches with a united agreement to refer the matter to the next A. M. through the proper channel to fully define the automobile advices so as to understandingly and in union adjust all the past auto troubles and fully define the basis or course of procedure for the future, in order to restore peace and union in our beloved brotherhood, pleading with members and elders and churches to exercise patience toward each other till the above is defined and outlined by A. M.

Signed: M. Montgomery, G. W. Balsbaugh, E. M. Senseney, I. P. Stitely, Josiah B. Rinehart.

Report of Committee to Ohio

1921 The committee consisting of John F. Flora, Aaron P Metzger, John D. Benedict, J. D. Miller and J. B. Wertz sent by A. M. of 1920 to adjust troubles in Lower and Upper Twin, Donnels Creek and Covington churches in the state of Ohio, submitted reports of their investigations and findings in the several churches where they labored, which reports were accepted by the Annual Meeting of 1921.

Committee of Last Year to Covington Church, Sent Back

1921 Inasmuch as the formulating and circulating of petitions in our Brotherhood in times past has been the cause of much trouble and confusion; and we being confronted again this year (1921) with a petition from the Covington, Ohio, Elders and part of the church, similar to last year, this Annual Meeting of 1921, concludes that to formulate and circulate petitions does bring disunion and much unnecessary trouble: Therefore this Annual Meeting decides that the Covington elders did wrong and will be expected to make satisfaction for the same, and concludes to send back the Committee this year, that was there last year, to see that their former conclusions are carried out; and further, to set in order anything that they may find out of order and not in line with the Gospel and ruling of the Annual Meeting and, further, we decide that any elders and churches not satisfied with minutes of A. M. should come to the A. M. in regular order by asking for reconsideration or repeal, and not resort to the circulation of petitions which is almost sure to cause confusion and discord among brethren. Approved and Passed.

Tent Committee

1922 We, your Tent Committee, in council have agreed to purchase a new dining tent, not including "poles and side walls." Also, we have agreed on same weight (10 oz. ducking) as the old one, and to paraffine same before using.

And we have appointed the following brethren to purchase same, namely, Frank Petry, D. D. Skiles and Ezra Denlinger, subject to approval of A. M.

Furthermore, inasmuch as there are but two brethren of the tent committee in the Western District we have appointed Bro. Elmer Flory of Douglas Co., Kans., to fill the vacancy.

In behalf of Tent Committee. Ezra Denlinger, Treas.

Approved and Passed.

Vindicator Committee

We, the Vindicator Committee having in August, 1921, added Bro. J. M Kimmel to our staff do present our labor to the A. M. of 1922, subject to its approval. Committee: I. H. Cool, Samuel Leedy, John F. Shaeffer, Samuel Stoneroad, Geo. Bowser. Approved and Passed.

Tent Committee

1923 To the Standing Committee:

Report of treasurer of the A. M. Tent Committee, 1923. We the undersigned as authorized by Annual Meeting of 1922 to purchase a new cover for the dining tent, have done so and will therefore make a full report.

We have solicited the four districts of the Brotherhood for funds as follows:

Appropriations received from

Eastern District	$ 235.66
Ohio District	393.44
Indiana District	256.50

Western District	319.30
Received for the old tent	211.28
Balance in treasury last year	60.23
Total received with balance of last year	$1,476.41

Expenditures are as follows:

Paid for new tent	$1,029.00
Paid for shipping new tent	9.55
Paid for gasoline for paraffining new tent	34.32
Paid for paraffine	12.31
Paid for four new quarter poles	6.80
Paid for shipping old tent to Ind.	77.50
Paid for traveling expenses, postage stamps and other minor expenses	37.99
Total paid out	$1,207.47
Total Receipts	$1,476.41
Total expenditures	$1,207.47
Balance in treasury	$ 268.94

Frank Petry, D. D. Skiles, Ezra Denlinger, Treasurer.

Accepted by Standing Committee J. B. Rinehart, Clerk

Approved by the meeting.

Tent Committee

1924 To the Standing Committee of the A. M. of 1924. Greeting:

We your Tent Committee having met in council for some future consideration,

(1) Inasmuch as our dear Brother Franklin Petry's physical condition is such that it necessitates our appointment of another one in his stead and by his request we have appointed Brother J. N. Stoner, New Madison, Ohio, to serve instead of Brother Petry. Subject to approval of Standing Committee.

Ezra Denlinger, Treasurer.

Request of Tent Committee passed by A. M.

Vindicator Committee Appointment

1925 We, the Vindicator Committee, having lost one of our number by the death of Elder Isaac H. Cool, have chosen Elder Benjamin E. Beckner to labor with us on the editorial staff of The Vindicator, subject to approval of Annual Meeting. Samuel Stoneroad, Samuel Leedy, John F. Schaeffer, George Bwoser, J. M. Kimmel. Passed.

Tent Committee

1925 To the Annual Meeting of 1925, Greeting:

Received from the Brotherhood since last year's A. M.	$783.00
Due on last year's freight	45.71
For shipping tents to Indiana	342.00
Total Expenses	387.71
Balance on hand	395.28

Ezra Denlinger, Treasurer.

Report satisfactory to A. M.

Vindicator Committee

1926 We, the Vindicator Committee, have chosen Elder Philip Miller to serve with us on the editorial staff of the Vindicator subject to the approval of the Annual Meeting. Samuel Stoneroad, Samuel Leedy, John F. Shaeffer, Geo. Bowser, J. M. Kimmel, B. E. Beckner. Passed.

Tent Committee

May 25, 1926

1926 To the Annual Meeting of 1926, Greeting:

Total receipts from Brotherhood since June 1, 1925, with last year's balance	$430.50
Total expenses for shipping tents to Ohio and other expenditures since June 1, 1925	102.65
Balance in treasury	$327.85

Ezra Denlinger, Treasurer.

Report accepted by the meeting.

Report of Hymn Book Committee

1927 To the Annual Meeting of 1927, Greeting:

The present edition of our hymn books is about exhausted, another edition will be required, and as we have been given permission in the past to make corrections, we desire to submit the following for your consideration:

Some of the type are so worn that the impression is not perfect and some letters do not show in print.

Some of the hymns are written under wrong meter.

A few hymns require some changing in wording to make better harmony, and other minor corrections are needed.

To make the necessary corrections it may add about 5 to 6 cents per copy on the next edition.

The cost of printing and binding have advanced since the last edition was issued and this will also increase the cost of the next.

Requests have been made by a number for a leather binding which will increase the cost to approximately $1.00 per copy for semi-flexible black leather binding.

We suggest to print the next edition in both bindings.

Respectfully submitted: Wm. N.Kinsey, J. C. Darst, J. M. Kimmel, committee.

This Annual Meeting authorizes the Hymn Book Committee to issue a new and corrected edition of the Hymn Book in one binding only.

Tent Committee

1927 To the A. M. of 1927, Greeting:

We, your Tent Committee, having met in council for some future considerations submit the following:

First. Inasmuch as the physical condition of our dear brother, John Armstrong, is such that it necessitates our appointment of another in his stead, and by his request we have appointed Bro. John H. Riffey, of Westphalia, Kans. in his stead.

Second. Treasurer reports as follows:

Last year's balance	$327.85
Interest to April 1, 1927	27.14
Total receipts to date	$354.99
Paid for shipping tents to Pa.	136.00
Balance in treasury	$218.99

Subject to approval of Standing Committee.

Ezra Denlinger, Treasurer.

Report approved by the meeting.

Tent Committee

1928 To the A. M. of 1928, Greeting:

We, your Tent Committee, having met in council for some considerations, have only the treasurer's report which is as follows:

Last year's balance	$218.99
Interest to April 1, 1928	9.66
Total receipts to date	$228.65
Paid for shipping tents from Penn'a. to Ohio	$131.53
For other excpenses	5.25
Total	$136.78
Balance in treasury	$ 91.87

Submitted subject to approval of Standing Committee.

Ezra Denlinger, Treasurer.

Report accepted.

Tent Committee

1929 To the Annual Meeting of 1929, Greeting:

We your Tent Committee having met in council for some future consideration agree to report as follows:

First, Report of Treasury.

Last year's balance	$91.87
Received Interest since May 1, 1928	5.73
Total Receipts to Date	$97.60
Paid for Shipping Tents from Ohio to Ind.	85.00
Balance in Treasury	$12.60

Second, Inasmuch as our Council Tent has been destroyed by storm, we your Tent Committee have unitedly agreed to purchase a new tent.

Third, Inasmuch as our treasury is about to be exhausted, we have unitedly agreed to solicit the Brotherhood for funds to cover the expense for a new tent, and for the renting of the Council Tent for this year and for future shipping of our tents. Submitted for the approval of the Annual Meeting of 1929.

By order of Tent Committee.

Ezra Denlinger, Treasurer.

We, your Standing Committee of 1929 unanimously agree to submit this report to our Brotherhood for consideration. Approved by the Meeting.

Report of Committee of 1929

1930 July 23, 1929 the committee authorized by the Annual Meeting of the Old German Baptist Church to confer with the Old Brethren to try to form a basis upon which a reuniting of the two bodies might be effected, did meet with them in the Middle Fork Church, Clinton Co., Ind. So after the meeting was opened in the regular order by devotional services, first by singing and prayer, the fourth chapter of Ephesians was read and a few brief remarks by the committee. We then proceeded as follows: first by having them state their feelings and desires up to the then present time, which did appear as if some of them were ready for terms of reconciliation. So the committee proceeded to give to them that which it unitedly agreed upon for its basis of reconciliation, which was as follows: We your committee cannot see any better way than to adopt the old established order of the Church for a gospel basis upon which to reunite the two bodies in one. This was as follows: first, to those who became dissatisfied with the telephone question and other matters and withdrew fellowship, that they make an acknowledgment of their error in withdrawing fellowship from the Church and organizing a separate body or church. Second, they shall ask pardon for said error. And third, they shall further agree from this time to work and throw their influence with the Church. And further, all those brethren in office shall be received as private members or in the laity. And further, all those whom they baptized wanting fellowship shall be rebaptized according to the decision of Annual Meeting. See minutes: 1852, Art. 22; 1861, Art. 9; 1882, Art. 5; also 1921, Art. 2, and 1 Corinthians XII:13.

And further, all those who have been disfellowshipped or expelled for some OTHER CAUSE than that referred to above and have associated themselves with the above named organized or separate body, if any such want fellowship they must go to the local congregation that disfellowshipped them and there make satisfaction for what they were expelled. And further, all unkind acts or unbecoming or hard expressions, if any, and wrong council, if any, shall be laid down by all on both sides of the controversy, and a cloak of charity spread over all such. The foregoing is the basis and propositions upon which the committee did work and labor to bring about a union of the two bodies, but sorry to say that after much discussion and talk the committee failed in its efforts to establish a union; therefore the matter rests as before.

Signed by the committee: G. P. Custer, Samuel Leedy, John F. Shaeffer, Levi Miller, J. B. Flora.

Report accepted by Annual Meeting.

Tent Expense of 1930

1931 ART. 7. Inasmuch as there exists a difference of opinion in the Brotherhood as to whether or not the expense of renting the tents for the A. M. which was held in California in 1930, shall be paid out of the treasury of the tent funds (owing to the impression that has gone out over the Brotherhood by some promises being made when the meeting was located in the far west, saying that the Brotherhood would not be burdened with said expense) there is now some controversy existing amongst members, some saying it would not be treating the Western District fair by soliciting them for funds to cover the expense for a new tent and also to let them bear their own expense in renting the tents for said A. M. And now as you will notice in this year's report of the Tent Committee, the Western District has not been solicited.

Therefore, we, your Tent Committee, with the counsel of some elders of the Standing Committee, have decided to submit the matter to this A. M. for consideration.

From the Tent Committee

Ezra Denlinger, D. D. Skiles, D. F. Denlinger.

Answer: We decide that the Western District shall be assessed pro rata, the same as the other three districts, for funds for the tent expenses, less the amount that they paid last year for rent of the tents used. Passed.

Report of the Tent Committee

1930 To the A. M. of 1930, Greeting: We the undersigned, as authorized by A. M. of 1929 to buy a new tent and to solicit the Brotherhood for funds to cover the expense for the same and also for other future expenditures, have done so and therefore make a full report since that time:

We have solicited only three districts of the Brotherhood, and the reason for that is stated at this A. M. in the form of a query:

May 1st, 1929, Balance in Treasury	$ 12.60
June 1, 1929, Received for the old tent	110.75
Oct. 1st, 1930, Received Interest	3.57
May 1st, 1931, Received from Ohio District	839.96
May 1st, 1931, Received from Indiana District	545.69
May 1st, 1931, Received from Eastern District	437.55
May 1st, 1931, Received Interest	42.24
Total Receipts to Date	$1,992.36

Expenditures Are as Follows:

June 1st, 1929, Paid for renting tent at N. Manchester, Indiana	$ 240.00
Aug. 13th, 1929, Paid traveling expenses for Committee Brethren sent to Indiana	17.25
May 19th, 1931, Paid for shipping tents from N. Manchester, Ind. to Pipe Creek District of Church, Indiana	17.50
May 19th, 1931, Paid for new tent	791.00
Paid for traveling expenses	6.00

May 25th, 1931, Total Expenditures	$1,071.75
Balance in Treasury	$ 920.61

Ezra Denlinger, D. D. Skiles, D. F. Denlinger.

Accepted by A. M. Council, May 26th, 1931.

Tent Committee's Report

1932 To the Annual Meeting of 1932, Greeting: We, your Tent Committee, having met in council for some considerations, have only the treasury to report, which is as follows:

Last Year's Balance	$ 920.62
May 25th, 1931, Received a Balance of the Florida Funds	7.31
Dec. 21st, 1931, Received a Balance of the Quota from the Western District of Churches	165.20
Total Receipts up to date, plus last year's balance	$1,093.13
May 25th, 1931, Paid for Tent Repair	9.55
Nov. 12th, 1931, Paid for Shipping Tent from Indiana To Ohio	45.00
Total expenditures	$ 54.55
Balance in Treasury	$1,038.58

The following report is to inform the Brotherhood of the condition of the treasury:

Inasmuch as the money that has been solicited for the purpose of buying a new tent and for other expenses is being tied up, and had to borrow money to pay for the same, and as the loaner has agreed to carry it for another year, we, your Tent Committee, have unitedly agreed to let it stand as it is, subject to approval of Standing Committee.

By Order of Tent Committee. Ezra Denlinger, Treas.

Accepted by A. M. Council, May 18th, 1932.

Report of Tent Committee

1934 To the Annual Meeting of 1934, Greeting:

Inasmuch as there has not been any report made by the Tent Committee since 1932, due to the unsettled condition of the treasury, we will therefore make a full report since that time.

First, due to the loss of our dear Brother Solomon Hay by death, we your Tent Committee have unitedly agreed to appoint Brother Alpha Austin, of Rossville, Ind., in his stead.

Second, Treasurer reports as follows:

May 25, 1933, balance in Treasury	$ 154.27
Received from Western District	286.36
Received from Indiana District	216.34
Received from Ohio District	322.15
Received from Eastern District	193.07
Total receipts to date with last year's balance	$1,172.19
May 21, 1933—Paid for shipping tents to Virginia and and back to Ohio	$ 140.27
Paid for water spigots	14.00
May 21, 1934, Paid for shipping tents to Preble County, Ohio	18.00
Paid off the old debt that was owed to the treasurer due to the loss of former account	629.07
Total expenditure since May 30, 1933	$ 801.34
May 21, 1934, Balance in Treasury	$ 370.85

Submitted for the approval of the A. M. of 1934.

By order of the Tent Committee. Ezra Denlinger, Treas.

Approved by the meeting.

Report of Committee On Plan for Sending Ministers to Isolated Churches

1935 To the Annual Meeting of 1935, Greeting: Inasmuch as Annual Meeting of 1934 has appointed us as a committee to formulate a plan by which all isolated churches might be more frequently reached with ministerial aid, and that their expenses might be paid by other churches, or by the Brotherhood; in view of the above request we your committee have made strong efforts to unite on some plan; but by a careful study of our former Minutes and Resolutions, we find it very difficult to formulate a plan that will not conflict with the same, therefore we could not unitedly agree on a certain plan. Nevertheless, we will submit the following for your consideration:

We are made to feel the great responsibility that we, as a committee, are placed under when we consider the great need of those isolated churches. On the other hand, when we consider the Resolutions, page 39, appendix of Minute Book, which we do not wish to ignore (for we believe the brethren who wrote them felt in their very hearts to stop all missionary plans or mission boards as then granted by Annual Meeting); yet we are made to feel that they did not feel to stop the work entirely if rightly carried out.

For further evidence, see Resolutions in appendix of Minute Book, page 40, which reads as follows: "We are by no means opposed to mission-work, if carried out in gospel order. Neither are we opposed to assist our poor ministers in such work."

For further consideration we refer to the latter part of section 5 of Reconsidered Minutes, appendix of Minute Book, page 4, which reads, "—No treasury in the hands of a board." To this we heartily agree, but suggest that it be put in the hands of the church, that the church may have the exclusive oversight. With these thoughts under consideration, we offer the following plan to the Annual Meeting of 1935 for consideration:

Inasmuch as the query asked assistance only for isolated churches, hence let it be so agreed and understood that this plan only applies to states named: North Dakota, Wisconsin, Iowa, northern Illinois, Colorado, Oklahoma, Florida, West Virginia, and Canada.

First. Let the elders in charge of the isolated churches of afore named states and Canada, together with the council of said churches, call on ministering brethren whom they may desire—limiting them to two or not more than three calls per year, and taking into consideration the distance and expense—in other words confine their calls to brethren the nearest to them as much as convenient, and if for any reason brethren called could not go, then instead of them sending some one in their place, let the church as before, say whom they desire.

As to other churches of the remaining part of the Brotherhood, that are somewhat isolated, we could advise that our ministers should visit such churches more frequently, and also other members who are financially able to assist in taking ministers to such churches, or in helping otherwise to meet their expenses.

Second. For collecting money to bear the expense of those ministers who are called to those isolated churches who are not able financially to bear their own expense:

(1) Let the Brotherhood be divided into two districts: Ohio and Eastern, Indiana and Western, including Michigan.

(2) Let the elders in charge of the local churches of each named district ask (beginning with one of the above named districts, when their contribution is spent, then each of the above named districts in turn thereafter) their congregations to contribute to the cause. Every man according as he purposes in his heart, so let him give.

Third. Let the Standing Committee of 1935 select a brother, to be approved by the Brotherhood, whose duty it shall be to notify through The Vindicator each district when its contribution is needed, and to take charge of said money given by the Brotherhood, and to make such payment to brethren that are called as to further statement of their expenses to and from the churches. Also to keep a full record of all money received and paid out, and render a full statement each year to the Brotherhood through The Vindicator.

Fourth. Let the ministering brethren that have been called by those isolated churches make a full report of their expenses to and from the meeting, and if said church feels to pay part of the expense, let it be so stated by the elder in charge, and inserted in statement. Likewise, if said ministers feel to bear part of their expenses, let them also make a statement of the same and send full statement to the brother in charge of money contributed by the Brotherhood, and he shall refund to full amount per statement rendered. It is further agreed and understood that no brother shall be paid his expenses to and from isolated churches that has not been called by said church, or any one accompanying said brother or brethren.

It is further understood that this plan does not prohibit any ministering brother to offer his services to those churches by bearing his own expenses to and from the meeting, if he feels able so to do, but it rather encourages all ministers who are any wise able financially to assist those churches as much as possible in their isolated condition.

Tenderly Submitted

Ezra Denlinger, Enos Eikenberry, John C. Bowser

The above report was accepted by the Meeting.

Brother Alfred Brubaker was appointed to take charge of the work as required in section third of the report.

Report of Committees to Churches

The committee composed of O. A. Custer, A. C. Hess, Leander Miller, J. T. Rutrough, H. G. Benedict, sent last year to Oak Grove, Painter Creek, and Palestine churches, Ohio, submitted reports of their labors in each of said churches respectively, all of which were accepted by the meeting.

The committee composed of J. W. Skiles, Solomon Stoner, C. E. Jamison, Simeon Frantz, W. T. Hess, sent last year to the New River church, California, submitted a report of their labors in said church which was accepted by the meeting.

Report of the Tent Committee

To the A. M. of 1935, Greetings: We your committee having met in council for some future considerations, will report the following:

First. Owing to the physical condition of our dear Bro. Daniel F. Denlinger, of the Ohio District, we have unitedly agreed to accept his resignation and have appointed Bro. Alfred Brubaker, of Eaton, Ohio, in his stead. And, again, inasmuch as Bro. Rolla Flora has moved from the Indiana District to Wisconsin, we have transferred him to the Western District, and have appointed Bro. Harvey Metzger, of Elkhart, Indiana, in his stead.

May 22nd, 1934, balance in Treasury	$322.94
May 22, 1934 received from Western District	44.16
Received from Eastern District	3.75
Received from Ohio District	33.05
June 11, 1935, Total receipts plus last year's balance	403.90
Paid for shipping tents from Ohio to Indiana	15.00
June 11, 1935, balance in treasury at date	388.90

Submitted for the approval of A. M. of 1935.

By order of Tent Committee. Ezra Denlinger, Treas.

Accepted by the Meeting.

Report of the Tent Committee June 2, 1936

1936 To the A. M. of 1936, Greeting: We your Tent Committee having met in council for some future consideration, will report the following:

First, owing to the age and physical condition of our dear Brother Daniel D. Skiles, of the Indiana District, we have unitedly agreed to accept his resignation, and have appointed Brother Ezra Flora, of Flora, Indiana, in his stead. The report of the Treasury is as follows:

June 11, 1935, Balance in Treasury	$388.90
July 1, 1935, Received Interest	3.89
June 2, 1936, Total Receipts	$392.79
EXPENDITURES—	
June 12, 1935, Spent for tent repairs	$ 2.98
June 2, 1936, Paid for shipping tents to Kansas and back to Indiana	162.00
Paid rent for use of storing tent trucks	5.00
For tent repairs	3.74
For traveling expenses	13.00

Total Expenditures	$186.72
June 2, 1936, Balance in Treasury	$206.67

Submitted for approval of the A. M. of 1936.

By order of Tent Committee. Ezra Denlinger, Treas.

Report accepted.

Report of the Tent Committee

1937 To the A. M. of 1937, Greeting: We your Tent Committee having met in council for some future consideration will report the following:

We unitedly agree to recommend to this meeting that a new dining tent, top and side-walls, also side-walls for the council tent be purchased. For this labor we have appointed Brethren Ezra Denlinger, Alpha Austin and Alfred Brubaker.

We also agree to ask this meeting for permission to solicit the Brotherhood for funds to pay for this equipment and for shipping tents, and for other expenses.

The report of the Treasury is as follows:

June 3, 1936, balance in Treasury	$210.57
July 1, 1936, received interest	2.26
July 2, 1937, received interest	1.59
Total Receipts with last year's balance	$214.42
EXPENDITURES—	
Dec. 7, 1936, for tent repair	$ 2.18
Dec. 7, 1936, for trucking tents to Adam Blocher's place	6.00
Dec. 7, 1936, for tent storage	3.00
May 10, 1937, for 10 guy ropes	28.85
May 10, 1937, other expenses	1.40
May 18, 1937, Total expense	$ 41.43
May 18, 1937, Balance in Treasury	$172.99

Submitted for the approval of the A. M. of 1937.

By order of the Tent Committee. Ezra Denlinger, Treas.

Approved by the Annual Meeting.

Report of Tent Committee

1938 To the A. M. of 1938, Greeting: The three brethren who were authorized by the A. M. of 1937 to purchase a new dining tent, and side walls for Council tent, and to solicit the Brotherhood for funds to pay for same and for other expenses, have done so.

And the committee wishes to report further, as follows—

Our dear Bro. Jacob N. Stoner of the Ohio District, (owing to his health) has requested to be relieved from this committee, and we appoint in his stead Bro. Lester Fisher.

Also our dear Bro. David W. Stitely, of the Eastern District, having been elected to the ministry requested to be relieved and we appoint in his stead Bro. C. J. Ecker.

Treasury Report:

RECEIPTS—

May 18, 1937, Balance in treasury	$ 172.99
May 19, 1937, Received for old dining tent	135.00
May 27, 1937, Received balance of old account, (See tent committee report 1932)	598.63
June 22, 1937, Received for old tent equipment	33.85
July 1, 1937, Received interest	1.28
Nov. 22, 1937, Received from Ohio District	333.00
Nov. 22, Received from Western District	243.80
Nov. 22, Received from Indiana District	237.30
Nov. 22, Received from Eastern District	182.20
Jan. 3, 1938, Received interest	5.19
Total receipts	$1,943.24

EXPENDITURES—

Nov. 1937, Paid for trucking tents from Ind. to Ohio	$ 30.00
Dec. 28, 1937, Paid for new tent equipment	1,641.50
Dec, 1937, Paid for traveling expenses	18.09
Feb. 2, 1938, Transportation, new tents from Toledo to Pharaoh Baker's	13.60
Total expenditures	$1,703.19
June 7, 1938, Balance in Treasury	$ 240.05

Respectfully submitted for approval of this A. M. by order of tent committee. Ezra Denlinger, Treasurer.

Report accepted.

Report of Tent Committee

1940 To the Annual Meeting of 1940, Greeting: We your Tent Committee, having met in council for some considerations, do report as follows:

There has been no report since 1938, and as yet we have nothing to report but the Treasury:

June 1, 1938, I had a balance in treasury of	$240.55
Received interest since that time	6.33
May 14, 1940, total receipts with the balance of 1938	$246.88

EXPENDITURES AS FOLLOWS:

June 1, 1939, paid for shipping tents to Pennsylvania and back to Ohio	$100.00
And for other incidentals	15.00
Sept. 16, 1939, paid for shipping tents to S. J. Garber's	6.00
May 14, 1940, paid for stakes, ropes, wall poles and curtain repair	35.55
Total Expenditures since 1938	$156.55
May 14, 1940, Balance in Treasury	$ 90.33

Submitted for the approval of the A. M. of 1940.

By order of Tent Committee. Ezra Denlinger, Treas.

Approved by the Annual Meeting.

Index for the Book of Minutes

1940 To the Standing Committee of the A. M. of 1940, Greeting: I have an index for the minutes of A. M. 1778 to 1939 including also the Resolutions of 1881. which I desire to give to the Brotherhood provided she will accept it and see to the publishing of it as she does the minutes, etc. I ask no temporal interest in it. My name need not appear in it, and the wording of the preface can be changed to suit. Isaac H. Bashore.

A committee of three (to consist of Brethren J. M. Kimmel, Arthur R. King, and Ervan Eikenberry) was proposed to look into the matter and have the same printed if they see fit. Confirmed by the A. M.

Report of Committee On Annual Meeting Minute Index

1941 To the Annual Meeting of 1941, Greeting: We as the committee appointed by the A. M. of 1940 to examine an index of the Minutes of our Annual Meetings, compiled by Elder Isaac H. Bashore, and to consider the propriety of having the same printed in a separate booklet, having carefully looked into the matter from several points of view, came to the following agreement: We do not feel to take the responsibility of having the index printed without further counsel from Annual Meeting. Our reasons for so agreeing are:

First, The last published edition of our minute book being well nigh exhausted, some members are looking forward to a new edition in the near future which should include all the minutes to date and a new complete index for the same. Should this be brought about this separate index as proposed would be of no use.

Second, Also it is suggested that in a new Minute Book the minutes be classified by bringing all decisions on the same subject together under one heading with the subjects arranged in alphabetical order. In that case also the separate index would be of no practical use.

In view of the above reasons we did not feel to proceed hastily with the printing of the index, but would propose to defer the matter indefinitely. Respectfully Submitted,

J. M. Kimmel, A. R. King, Ervan Eikenberry, Committee.

The above report was accepted by the meeting and the committee was retained to make arrangements for the printing of a new Minute Book and report to next Annual Meeting.

Report of the Minute Book Committee

1942 To the Annual Meeting of 1942, Greeting: We the committee appointed by the A. M. of 1940 to consider the printing of an index to our Book of Minutes and later minutes of the Annual Meetings (compiled by Elder I. H. Bashore) having found there existed a desire upon the part of a number of members to have a new edition of the minutes printed with all minutes to date and a complete index included, did, therefore, in view of said desire, report to the A. M. of 1941 that in our judgment it would be well to defer the printing of the aforesaid index indefinitely or till it be decided whether or not the proposed new minute book shall be printed.

The A. M. of 1941 accepted our report and retained us as a committee to make arrangements for the printing of a new minute book and to report to the A. M. of this year.

In our endeavor to carry out said instructions we found that a number of brethren were in favor of having the minutes classified, while others would be satisfied to have the present book reprinted as it is, that is, in the consecutive form. We therefore, proceeded to obtain price quotations on 1000 copies.

First, in the consecutive form as at present. For this form the stereotype plates (which have been kept) which were used in printing former editions could be used again with minor alterations, whereby there would be a considerable saving in cost. The sale price per single copy in this form, according to quotations at hand would be around $1.75.

Second, in the classified form for which all new type would be required, the price per single copy would have to be probably more than twice that of the consecutive form.

The quotations we obtained were for immediate acceptance. By the time we can be prepared to place an order there may be some variation from prices now at hand. However, we may be able to make further investigation with the object of getting the work done at a somewhat lower cost.

This report is presented for the consideration of this A. M. in deciding which (if either) of the two forms herein described, it will adopt.

Respectfully Submitted, J. M. Kimmel, Arthur R. King, Ervan Eikenberry, Committee.

The Standing Committee anticipating that this A. M. would accept the above report, thinks it well to retain the present Minute Book Committee and that they shall be paid for their labors by the treasurer of the Tent Committee. Passed by the Meeting. This meeting decides further that a new Minute Book be printed, and it is left to the judgment of the committee of what kind it shall be, and that they may add to their number as they see fit.

Report of the Tent Committee

1942 To the A. M. assembled, Greeting:—We your Tent Committee having met in council for future consideration, and as there has been no report made since 1940, unitedly agree to report as follows:

First, Treasury Report.

May 14, 1940, Balance in Treasury	$90.33
Received for rope sold	5.00
May 6, 1941, Total Receipts plus Balance	$95.33
EXPENDITURES—	
Dec. 3, 1940, Shipping tents to Indiana	$15.00
Phoning and other expenses	2.00
June 2, 1941, Traveling expenses	5.00
May 26, 1942, Total expenses since May 14, 1940	22.00
May 6, 1942, Balance in Treasury	$73.33

Second, since there are not sufficient funds in the treasury to carry expenses to date, we ask for permission to solicit the Brotherhood at this time, and our treasurer desires to make this call through the Vindicator instead of by letter to each district. At present about the only expenses we have are transportation, storage, etc., as our tent equipment appears to be in excellent condition.

Subject to approval of this A. M. Ezra Denlinger, Treas.

Report accepted and request granted.

Report of the C. O. Committee

At a Brotherhood meeting held in the Lower Stillwater church, Ohio, on Dec. 10, 1940, a committee of seven brethren was appointed whose duty it was made to investigate and consider matters relative to the care and location of our members and members' boys who might be called by the Government of the U. S. for duty under the Selective Training and Service Act.

The Committee has endeavored to meet the issue arising from time to time, and has made special effort to dispose of the same to the best interest of our conscripted boys in keeping with the faith and practice of our Brotherhood.

Conditions indicate that the program would continue on indefinitely. With an increase of boys in camps and along with possible changes in legislation and camp management, including their financial support, it seems very necesary that some one be empowered by Annual Conference to still look after the affairs arising from such a program. Therefore the present Service Committee would like to know whether this A. M. of 1942 still desires its services.

Respectfully Submitted, J. W. Skiles, H. G. Benedict, E. W. Jamison, L. R. Kinzie, J. A. Wagoner, J. M. Reece, A. R. King.

The above report was accepted by the Meeting, and the committee was retained to continue its services as the condition may require.

A. M. Materials to Be Held Jointly

Flora, Indiana, June 15, 1943

1943 To the Brethren and Sisters of the Districts of Indiana and Ohio, assembled in Annual Conference of 1943, Greeting:

We, your committee, appointed by a representative body of elders and ministers from the State of Ohio; to meet with The Committee of Arrangements of Annual Meeting of 1943, to consider the advisability of holding jointly, by the districts of Indiana and Ohio; the hardware utensils; bedding materials and some lumber, etc., used in the conduct of our Anual Conference; due to the present inability to continue the purchase of these materials, because of the existing national emergency; beg to submit the following report:

Having met with The Committee of Arrangements, and having effected an agreement of joint ownership, with said committee; have appointed a committee of six brethren, as follows:

Brethren Perry Miller; Edward Eller and Irvin Angle of Indiana; and Brethren Jacob Shellabarger; Alfred Brubaker and Lester Fisher of Ohio; to have full charge of the above materials, to be held and used jointly by these two districts for the duration of the present national emergency.

Therefore, we submit the above report for the consideration of the members of the States of Indiana, Michigan and Ohio.

Signed in behalf of the Committee, N. A. Hockman, J. W. Thomas.

Report adopted.

Tent Committee's Report

Flora, Indiana, June 14, 1943

To the Annual Meeting Assembled, Greeting:

We, your tent committee, having met in council according to regular order, report as follows:

As we assemble together we keenly feel the vacancy in our committee caused by the passing of our dear Brother Ezra Denlinger. This vacancy leaves us without a foreman and secretary-treasurer; also a vacancy in the Ohio tent committee.

First, Brother Noah M. Lesher was selected as temporary foreman who took charge of our reorganization, in which Brother Alpha Austin of Indiana, was chosen as foreman, and Brother Alfred J. Brubaker of Ohio, as Secretary-treasurer.

Further, we unitedly propose to change tent-raising day from Tuesday until Thursday, subject to approval of the tent committee and the committee of arrangements where the meeting is being held.

Next, our dear Brother Rolla Flora, having been called to the ministry, requested to be relieved from our committee, which request was granted.

Further, the vacancy in the Ohio committee was filled by choosing Brother John Flora of the Salem District.

No financial report can be given at this time due to legal requirements which demand that a successor be duly chosen and qualified before the money held by our deceased treasurer can be released.

Subject to approval of this meeting.

Approved by the Meeting.

Noah M. Lesher, Alpha Austin, Alfred J. Brubaker.

Report of the Minute Book Committee

To the Annual Meeting of 1943, Greeting:

In compliance with the conclusion and direction of the Annual Meeting of last year, regarding the republication of our Book of Minutes, we as the committee entrusted with this work, believing that there existed a prevailing desire in the Brotherhood to have the minutes in a classified form, decided after some consideration to undertake to classify them. Accordingly we proceeded, as soon as practicable, with the difficult and somewhat perplexing task and after devoting considerable time and thought to the work, succeeded in bringing it to the point where we were ready to submit it to be printed, with the hope that it might be completed and ready for distribution by the time of this Annual Meeting.

But after consulting several different publishing firms and soliciting bids on the work, we found that none of them were in a position to take it or to quote a price under existing conditions. One house, however, stated that it might be able to handle it by mid-summer, and we intend to make further efforts by that time to get the book printed, and we entertain the hope that it will be issued sometime this coming fall, Divine Providence permitting.

Respectfully Submitted, J. M. Kimmel, Arthur R. King, Ervan Eikenberry.

Approved by the Meeting.

Report of the C. O. Service Committee

To the Annual Meeting of 1943, Greeting:

A goodly number of our C. O. boys of Camp Lagro, have been transferred from that place to detached service on dairy farms and in hospitals. Some have been sent to Pennsylvania, Maryland, Illinois and Virginia. Requests have come from these boys, their parents and also from their former manager at Camp Lagro, that some provision be made for their spiritual needs and comfort. The C. O. Service Committee recommend that this condition be taken care of by appointing brethren to visit these boys and satisfy their requests.

The names of Brother Harry G. Benedict and Brother Elmer W. Jamison are suggested to look after boys in the East and South East, and Brother Lester R. Kinzie those in Illinois. The Brethren sent to be paid actual expenses out of the Brotherhood C. O. Fund

We desire to know if this A. M. will grant and approve the above requests. The C. O. Service Committee.

Granted and approved by the meeting.

PART IV.

STANDING COMMITTEES

(Or Signers of the Minutes)

1785 Written May 15, 1785, at the big meeting on Big Conewago, from your brethren, united in love, Jacob Saur, Valentine Pressel, Mich. Bosserman, Martin Reinhart, David Studebaker, Peter Dierdorf, Martin Urner, Jacob Stoll, Christian Longenecker, Henry Neff, Lorenz Beckner, Philip Lewig.

1799 Martin Urner, Martin Gaby, Henry Danner, Peter Leibert, Jacob Danner, Philip Engler, Michael Pfoutz, Martin Garber, Daniel Utz, Philip Levy, Valentine Pressel, Stephen Ulrich.

1837 Daniel Gerber, John Flohry, Daniel Pfoutz, Daniel Arnold, Joseph Gerber, Christ. Johnson, John Price, George Hoke, Abraham Gerber, Benj. Bowman, Abraham Yandt, Daniel Reichard.

1838 Daniel Gerber, David Pfoutz, George Hoke, John Gerber, Jacob Holsinger, David Engler, sen., Abraham Yandt, John Funk, John Brower, Christ. Johnson, Jacob Pfoutz, Daniel Arnold, Christ. Long, John Price, John Royer, Lorenz Etter, John Farny, John Beeghly.

1840 Daniel Gerber, David Pfoutz, Daniel Arnold, Jacob Holsinger, Christian Long, George Hoke, John Price, Daniel Reichard, Abra Yandt, Michel Dicky, Peter Kober, Isaac Shoemaker, Henry Kurtz.

1841 Daniel Gerber, David Pfoutz, Christian Long, Daniel Arnold, George Hoke, Abraham Yandt, John Hart, John Price, Daniel Reichard, Henry Kurtz.

1842 Daniel Gerber, Christian Long, John Beeghly, John Price, Dan. Bollinger, David Pfoutz, Jacob Pfoutz, Christ. Jansen, David Ecker, John Sprogle, George Hoke, Jacob Long, And. Spanogle, John Gerber, James Tracey, Henry Kurtz.

1843 George Hoke, John Brower, John Hart, George Shively, Henry Metzger, Joseph Showalter, Isaac Beery, John Cable, Daniel Miller, John Shoemaker, James Tracey, Henry Kurtz.

1844 David Pfoutz, Christian Long, John Price, And. Spanogle, of Pennsylvania; Geo. Hoke, Geo. Shively, Henry Kurtz, of Ohio; John Bowman, Benj. Bowman, Daniel Miller, of Virginia; John Gerber, Jacob Long, of Maryland; and the following other brethren: Peter Nead, John Mineely, Peter Long, John H. Umstad, Jacob Pfoutz, Jacob Brubacher.

1845 George Shively, Abraham Crumpacker, Peter Frantz, John Bowman, Benjamin Bowman, Daniel Barnhart, Peter Miller, Peter Nead, Christian Bowman, Samuel Garber, Austin Hylton, John Gerber, John Kline, Henry Kurtz.

1846 David Pfoutz, George Hoke, Jacob Pfoutz, Christian Long, John Bowman, Dan Bollinger, Andre Spanogle, Peter Nead, Dan. Miller, Dan. Bernhart, Jacob Fahrney, John Funk, Peter Long, Dan. Fretz, John Price, John H. Umstad, James H. Tracey, David Shallenberger, Henry Kurtz.

1847 David Pfoutz, John Price, Geo. Hoke, Daniel Bollinger, Jacob Holsinger, Jacob Pfoutz, Jacob Fahrney, John Funk, John Molsbaugh, Philip Boyle, Samuel Miller, David Hardman, John H. Umstad.

1848 George Hoke, Joseph Gerber, John Hart, Henry Kurtz, Philip Boyle, Peter Nead, John Kline, —— ——, James H. Tracey, Michael Moyer, John Metzger, John Molsbaugh, George Shively, Jos. Showalter, Ben. Bowman, John Shoemaker, George Rarigh, John H. Umstad, Jacob Meyer, —— ——, David Shoemaker, Daniel Miller, John Shively, John Holsinger.

Special Conference

1848 George Hoke, George Shively, Joseph Showalter, and H. Kurtz, of Northeastern Ohio; Joseph Gerber and P. Nead, of Southwestern Ohio; Dan. Cripe, of Elkhart, Indiana; J. Molsbaugh, D. Miller, J. Hart, H. Metzger, J. Metzger, Jac. Brower, etc.

1849 Geo. Hoke, J. Showalter, Henry Kurtz, Peter Nead, A. Spanogle, J. Molsbaugh, Peter Long, John Kline, Jacob Sayler, Samuel Wampler, Peter Kober, Jacob Meyer, Daniel Yundt, George Shafer, Joh. Holsinger, Jac. Stutzman, D. Shoemaker, Jos. Arnold, Thos. Clarke.

1850 George Hoke, Peter Nead, James H. Tracey, Samuel Gerber, Joseph Gerber, John Brower, Benj. Bowman, Daniel Yundt, Dan. Bernhard.

1851 George Hoke, John Bowman, John Letherman, Christian Longenecker, John Kline, D. P. Sayler, Dan. Brower, Jam. H. Tracey, Jacob Meyer, Henry Kurtz.

1852 George Hoke, Geo. Shively, Jos. Emmert, John Kline, Dan. Bernhart, D. P. Sayler, Ben. Bowman, D. Miller, H. Kurtz.

1853 Geo. Hoke, Daniel Miller, Elias Dicky, of Ohio; Benj. Bowman, David Miller, of Indiana; Joseph Emmert, of Illinois; Benjamin Bowman, John Kline, of Virginia; Christ. Longenecker, Peter Long, of Pennsylvania; Jacob Sayler, of Maryland.

1854 George Hoke, George Shively, of Ohio; John Kline, Joseph Arnold, of Virginia; Philip Boyle, Dan. P. Sayler, of Maryland; C. Longenecker, John Berkley, of Pennsylvania; Jacob Miller, George Hoover, of Indiana; Joseph Emmert, Christian Long, of Illinois. Henry Kurtz, Clerk

1855 Geo. Hoke, John Molsbaugh, of Ohio; J. Leatherman, John Metzger, of Indiana; Daniel Frey, of Illinois; John Kline, Daniel Brower, of Virginia; Daniel P. Sayler, George Bear, of Maryland; Daniel Bollinger, John H. Umstad, John Berkley, Andrew Spanogle of Pennsylvania. Henry Kurtz, Clerk; James Quinter, Assistant Clerk.

1856 George Hoke, George Shively, John Leatherman, Jacob Long, Peter Nead, James Tracey, Joseph Emmert, John Berkley, Andrew Spanogle, John Kline, Joseph Arnold, Daniel Miller. Henry Kurtz, Clerk.

1857 John H. Umstad, Andrew Spanogle, Christ Keefer, John Wine, Abraham Neff, J. P. Ebersole, George Hoke, John Metzger, Abraham Moss, Joseph Emmert, Samuel Garver. D. P. Sayler, Clerk; James Quinter, Assistant Clerk.

1858 George Hoke, John Brower, Peter Nead, Daniel Miller, of Ohio; John Berkley, of Pennsylvania; John Kline, Peter Nininger, of Virginia; Isaac Pfoutz, of Maryland; George Shively, John Metzger, John Moyer, of Indiana; John Emmert, of Illinois. D. P. Sayler, Clerk; James Quinter, Assistant Clerk

1859 John Kline, Jacob Thomas, of Virginia; Daniel P. Sayler, Isaac Pfoutz, of Maryland; John P. Ebersole, Henry Davy, James Quinter of Ohio; Jacob Miller, John Metzger, of Indiana; Samuel Layman, David Rittenhouse, of Illinois; John H. Umstad, Peter Long, John Berkley, of Pennsylvania. D. P. Sayler, J. Quinter, Clerks; D. P. Sayler, Moderator.

1860 Peter Nead, J. P. Ebersole, of Ohio; Henry Koontz, D. P. Sayler, of Maryland; John Kline, Daniel Barnhart, Abraham Neff, Peter Nininger, of Virginia; John Metzger, of Indiana; Christian Long, of Illinois. D. P. Sayler, J. Quinter, Clerks; D. P. Sayler, **Moderator.**

1861 Joseph Arnold, George Shaver, Peter Crumpacker, Martin Miller, Daniel Miller, of Ohio. John Kline, Moderator; Benjamin F. Moomaw, Secretary.

1862 John Berkley, John Zug, D. P. Sayler, Clerk; John Kline, Moderator; John Wine, John Brower, Henry Kurtz, Jos. Showalter, John Metzger, Jacob Miller, Sam. Garber, Daniel Sturgis, John Bower, John Ogg, Abraham Replogle, James Quinter, Clerk.

1863 John Wine, of Virginia; D. P. Sayler, of Maryland; Samuel Lehman and Christopher Long, of Illinois; Andrew Spanogle, Isaac Meyer, and John Holsinger, of Pennsylvania; Henry D. Davy and Daniel Miller, of Ohio; John Metzger and F. P. Loehr, of Indiana; David Brower, of Iowa. Henry Kurtz, James Quinter, Clerks; John Kline, Moderator.

1864 John Kline, John Wine, Virginia; Daniel P. Sayler, Maryland; Leonard Furry, David Gerlach, Pennsylvania; Henry Davy, James Quinter, Ohio; David Miller, John Bowman, Daniel Bowman, Indiana; Christian Long, Sam. Gerber, Illinois; Jacob Brower, Iowa; John Bower, Kansas.

1865 D. P. Sayler, Maryland; Joseph Arnold, Virginia; Joseph R. Hanawalt and John Wise, Pennsylvania; Peter Nead and H. D. Davy, Ohio; Jacob Miller and Hiel Hamilton, Indiana; Isom Gibson and John Metzger, Illinois; Frederick P. Loehr, Michigan; David Brower, Iowa; John Bower, Kansas. James Quinter, Clerk; H. D. Davy, Moderator.

1866 Daniel Keller, John Wise, of Pennsylvania; H. D. Davy, J. P. Ebersole, of Ohio; Christian Keefer, Henry Koontz, of Maryland; John Wine, Daniel Thomas, of Virginia; Jacob Miller, J. Knisely, of Indiana; C. Long, S. Garber, of Illinois; D. Derrich, of Tennessee. H. D. Davy, Moderator; James Quinter, Clerk.

1867 Joseph Risser, H. D. Davy, Moderator; James Quinter, First Clerk; David Miller, Jacob Metzger, Jesse Myers, Christian Long, John Fitz, Peter Long, Andrew Miller, John Holsinger, Peter Crumpacker, Daniel Thomas, John Wine, David Rittenhouse, John Murray, F. P. Loehr, Henry Koontz, Isaac Pfoutz, D. P. Sayler, Second Clerk; John Waybright, Door Keeper.

1868 John P. Ebersole, Daniel Miller, Henry D. Davy, Moderator; Jas. Quinter, First Clerk; B. F. Moomaw, Daniel Thomas, Jacob Wine, D. P. Sayler, Second Clerk; Isaac Pfoutz, David Long, Conrad J. Lint, Daniel M. Holsinger, Joseph Rohrer, David Bechtelheimer, Jacob Miller, Door Keeper; Daniel Bowman, F. P. Loehr, Christian Long, John Metzger, Samuel Lehman, John Wise, Jacob Brower, Abraham Replogle, Henry Brubaker, H. Kurtz, Peter Nead.

1869 Abraham Naff, John Wine, Peter Nead, John P. Ebersole, Henry D. Davy, Robert H. Miller, Jacob Flory, Jacob Berkey, John Metzger, Samuel Lehman, David Brower, Elias K. Buechly, John Wise, Grabill Meyers, David Gerlach, Isaac Pfoutz, D. P. Sayler, David Long, Abraham Malsby, F. W. Dove, James Quinter.

1870 J. Trostle, D. Long, D. Gerlach, I. Myers, John Wise, H. D. Davy, D. Brower, D. J. Peck, F. P. Loehr, P. Nininger, Jacob Wine, J. Quinter, Christ. Wenger, Jacob Metzger, Hiel Hamilton, E. Eby, M. Sisler, John Metzger, Jacob Hauger, G. R. Baker, A. Replogle, G. Witwer, Wm. Gish.

1871 John Zug, Moses Miller, John Wise, D. P. Sayler, David Long, Peter Crumpacker, Solomon Garber, Martin Cosner, David Derrick, F. W. Dove, D. P. Peck, J. P. Ebersole, H. D. Davy, J. Miller, Jacob Karns, George Hoover, D. Fry, John Metzger, John Harshey, Benjamin Beeghly, and James Quinter.

1872 H. D. Davy, Jacob Garver, John Brown, D. B. Sturgis, Jacob Metzger, R. H. Miller, Samuel Lehman, John Metzger, E. K. Beeghly, Christian Long, Daniel Zook, William Gish, Samuel Mohler, A. Malsbee, Ab. Neff, Solomon Garber, Martin Cosner, D. Long, D. P. Sayler, Jacob Riner, Jos. Hanawalt, J. Wise and J. Quinter.

1873 Henry Garst, B. F. Moomaw, S. Garver, M. Cosner, D. P. Sayler, D. Long, David Gerlach, Jacob Price, John Wise, H. D. Davy, John Brillhart, Jacob Garver, D. B. Sturgis, John Baker, Joseph McCarty, E. Eby, John Metzger, Henry Strickler, R. Badger, C. Harader, and J. Quinter.

1874 Henry Swadley, B. F. Moomaw, Martin Cosner, D. P. Sayler, D. Long, D. Garlach, J. Meyers, J. Quinter, Jacob Garver, J. P. Ebersole, H. D. Davy, J. Lichty, George Long, D. B. Sturgis, Jacob Flory, R. H. Miller, D. Rittenhouse, Rufus Gish, David Wolf, E. K. Beeghly, C. Long, C. Harader, G. Witwer, J. Hershey, Jesse Studebaker, Enoch Eby.

1875 A. H. Senseney, Em. Slifer, Wm. Hertzler, Jos. R. Hanawalt, J. Quinter, H. B. Hylton, Jacob Wine, Elias Auvil, Jacob Garber, J. P. Ebersole, H. D. Davy, D. B. Sturgis, Jesse Meyers, Hiel Hamilton, Enoch Eby, John Metzger, James R. Gish, Tobias Musser, C. Long, Jacob Brower, S. S. Mohler, Sam Stump, Isaac Miller, J. W. Brumbaugh.

1876 D. P. Sayler, D. Long, Samuel Harley, M. Miller, J. Quinter, E. Fleshman, I. Long, D. B. Arnold, G. Irwin, J. Brown, H. D. Davy, M. Shotts, J. Flory, R. H. Miller, E. Eby, D. E. Price, J. Metzger, Jos. Ogg, Abr. Stamy, Daniel Zook, Wm. Gish, Isaac Miller.

1877 Jonathan Lichty, G. R. Baker, J. A. Murray, E. Eby, D. E. Price, J. R. Gish, D. B. Sturgis, J. S. Snowberger, R. H. Miller, Moses T. Bare, S. Garber, Joseph Kauffman, John B. Mishler, Henry Swadley, Samuel A. Fike, J. H. Lemon, Solomon Garber, John Wise, James Quinter, Samuel Harley, D. Long, D. P. Sayler, and Jacob Trostle.

1878 Samuel Harley, Moses Miller, C. G. Lint, D. K. Sayler, Jeremiah Beeghly, C. Wertz, Martin Garber, D. B. Arnold, Elias Auvil, G. Irwin, J. P. Ebersole, Samuel Garber, John Knisely, David Neff, R. H. Miller, Enoch Eby, J. R. Gish, Joseph Hendricks, J. F. Eikenberry, R. Badger, D. D. Sell, John Hershey, Jonathan Lichty, Isaac. Miller.

1879 Andrew Hutchinson, Michael Sisler, E. K. Buechley, Edmund Forney, Joseph Hendricks, James R. Gish, Jesse Calvert, Joseph Amich, R. H. Miller,Isaac Miller, J. P. Ebersole, S. Z. Sharp, Abraham Flory, Mark Minser, Moses Miller, Christian Jacob Thomas, Joseph Wine, David Long.

Bucher, E. Auvil, Solomon Buckalew, J. H. Lemon, Isaac Long,

1880 C. Bucher, J. Quinter, L. Kimmel, D. P. Sayler, D. Long, P. Nininger, J. H. Lemon, J. Thomas, P. J. Brown, J. P. Ebersole, J. Kauffman, J. Calvert, D. Bechtelheimer, R. H. Miller, E. Eby, D. Deardorff, J. Wise, J. S. Snyder, J. Thomas, C. C. Root, S. S. Mohler, J. Lichty, M. F. Bare, I. Miller, J. Berkey.

1881 J. S. Flory, C. C. Root, Robert Badger, E. Forney, J. Rife, D. Sturgis, R. H. Miller, C. G. Lint, Samuel Harley, J. Trostle, D. B. Arnold, J. H. Lemon, Isaac Miller, A. Hutchison, J. Thomas, E. Eby, J. Wise, D. E. Wolfe, D. Brower, Joseph Kauffman, Moses Miller, D. P. Sayler, D. Stouffer, Isaac Long, G. C. Bowman, D. Hays.

1882 Jacob Metzger of Indiana; Abraham Flory, of Ohio; Isaac Pfoutz, of Maryland; Jacob Flora, of Indiana; Joseph Cripe, of Illinois; A. H. Senseney, of Maryland; Jacob Price, of Pennsylvania; John Harshey, of Missouri; G. V. Siler, of Ohio; Jacob Root, of Illinois; C. Flory, of Kansas; Aaron Frantz, of Ohio; Samuel Kinsey, of Ohio; Daniel Holsinger, of Iowa.

1883 Abraham Flory, Samuel Musselman, A. H. Senseney, Jacob Flora, John Harshey, William Cassell, Christopher Flory, Aaron Frantz, Samuel Kinsey.

1884 John Hershey, Missouri; Isaac Pfoutz, Maryland; D. H. Bonebrake, Pennsylvania; Joel Petry, Virginia; George Long, Michigan; Elijah P. Fleshman, West Virginia; Stephen Metzger and Abraham Flora, Indiana; William Cassell, George V. Siler, Abraham Flory, Aaron Frantz, and Joseph I. Cover, Ohio.

1885 Abraham Flory, Daniel Brower, William Cassel, Samuel Murray, and Aaron Frantz of Ohio; David Miller of Illinois; Enoch Frey and Stephen Metzger of Indiana; David Bonebrake and Daniel F. Good of Pennsylvania; John Hershey of Missouri; Christopher Flory of Kansas, and George Long of Michigan.

1886 Abraham Flory, H. D. Davy, Samuel Murray, George V. Siler, Daniel Brower, Aaron Frantz, William Cassell, Ohio; Jacob Flora, Stephen Metzger, Indiana; George Long, Michigan; D. F. Good, Pennsylvania; D. R. Stitley, Maryland; Joshua Kessler, Illinois. H. D. Davy, foreman; Aaron Frantz, reading clerk; Samuel Murray, writing clerk.

1887 John Brubaker, Virginia; Jacob B. Miller, Illinois; H. D. Davy, Abraham Flory, Aaron Frantz, Ohio; David R. Stitely, Maryland; S. Murray, William Cassell, Ohio; Stephen Metzger, Indiana; George Long, Michigan; D. Brower, Ohio; Enoch Frey, Indiana. H. D. Davy, foreman; A. Frantz, reading clerk; Samuel Murray, writing clerk; J. I. Cover, assistant clerk.

1888 A. Flory, George V. Siler, William Cassell, Aaron Frantz, Samuel Murray, Joseph I. Cover, Ohio; David H. Plaine, A. Crumpacker, Virginia; Abram Flora, Stephen Metzger, Indiana; Jacob B. Miller, Illinois; Samuel Musselman, Nebraska; George Long, Michigan. A Flory, foreman; A. Frantz, reading clerk; J. I. Cover, writing clerk; S. Murray, assistant clerk.

1889 A. Flory, A. Frantz, William Cassell, G. V. Siler, Samuel Murray, J. I. Cover, Ohio; Stephen Metzger, A. Flora, Enoch Frey, Indiana; Elias Brubaker, Joel B. Flora, Virginia; George Long, Michigan. A Flora, foreman; A. Frantz, reading clerk; J. I. Cover, writing clerk; each had an assistant.

1890 Enoch Frey, Indiana; David Grossnickle, Maryland; Christopher Flory, Kansas; George Long, Michigan; Stephen Metzger, Indiana; Samuel Murray, Henry Garber, Henry D. Davy, G. V. Siler, Aaron Frantz, William Cassell, Abraham Flory, Ohio. H. D. Davy, foreman; A. Frantz, reading clerk; George Long, assistant reading clerk; S. Murray, writing clerk; H. Garber, assistant writing clerk.

1891 Abraham Flora, Indiana; Christopher Flory, Kansas; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; Elias Brubaker, Virginia; Samuel Murray, William Cassell, Aaron Frantz, H. D. Davy, A Flory, Ohio; D. Grossnickle, Maryland; George Long, Michigan; Henry Garber, Ohio. H. D. Davy, foreman; A. Frantz, reading clerk; S. Murray, writing clerk.

1892 Abraham Flory, Ohio; Abraham Crumpacker, Virginia Samuel Murray, Ohio; Abraham Flora, Indiana; H. D. Davy, Ohio; L. P. Fleshman, West Virginia; Aaron Frantz, Henry Garber, Ohio; Daniel K. Sayler, Maryland; Abraham Baer, Kansas; Elias Brubaker, Virginia; David Grossnickle, Maryland; George V. Siler, Ohio. H. D. Davy, foreman; Aaron Frantz, reading clerk; Samuel Murray, writing clerk; H. Garber, assistant.

1893 Abraham Flory, Aaron Frantz, Ohio; Abarham Flora, Indiana; Samuel Murray, William Cassell, Ohio; A. Crumpacker, Virginia; D. H. Bonebrake, Pennsylvania; C. Flory, Kansas; Henry Garber, Ohio; Joshua Kessler, Illinois; M. Montgomery, Missouri; H. D. Davy, Ohio. H. D. Davy, foreman; A. Frantz, reading clerk; S. Murray, writing clerk.

1894 John Rinehart, Kansas; Andrew Miller, Illinois; Peter Heck, Kansas; Samuel Musselman, Nebraska; Emanuel Miller, Henry Garber, Ohio; John D. Musselman, Indiana; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; George Long, Michigan; Elias Brubaker, Virginia; G. V. Siler, Samuel Murray, Aaron Frantz, Ohio. A. Frantz, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; S. Murray, writing clerk.

1895 A. Crumpacker, Virginia; E. P. Fleshman, West Virginia; Aaron Frantz, William Cassell, G. V. Siler, Ohio; George Long, Michigan; Samuel Murray, California; Henry Garber, J. M. Mohler, Ohio; Elias Brubaker, Virginia; Joshua Kessler, Illinois; J. D. Musselman, Indiana. A. Frantz, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; S. Murray, writing clerk; George Long, assistant clerk.

1896 M. Montgomery, Missouri; A. Flora, J. D. Musselman, Indiana; Elias Brubaker, Virginia; William Cassell, G. V. Siler, J. M. Mohler, Henry Garber, A. Frantz, Ohio; George Long, Michigan; David Grossnickle, Maryland; Solomon Stamy, Iowa. A. Frantz, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; J. M. Mohler, writing clerk.

1897 J. M. Mohler, Ohio; George Long, Michigan; Solomon Stamy, Iowa; Aaron Frantz, Ohio; Peter Heck, Kansas; G. V. Siler, Ohio; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; Elias Brubaker, Virginia; Henry Garber, Ohio; J. D. Musselman, Indiana; William Cassell, Ohio; W. S. Noe, Illinois. A. Frantz, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; J. M. Mohler, writing clerk; M. Montgomery, assistant writing clerk.

1898 David Grossnickle, Maryland; G. V. Siler, Emanuel Miller, Aaron Frantz, William Cassell, Henry Garber, Ohio; George Long, Michigan; Elias Brubaker, Virginia; Peter Heck, Kansas; J. D. Musselman, Indiana; Andrew Miller, Illinois; J.

D. Benedict, Pennsylvania. A. Frantz, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; J. D. Benedict, writing clerk.

1899 David Grossnickle, Maryland; John D. Musselman, Indiana; George Long, Michigan; George V. Siler, Ohio; J. D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Emanuel Miller, Henry Garber, John Garber, Virginia; William Cassell, Ohio; Levi H. Sides, North Carolina. Aaron Frantz, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; J. D. Benedict, writing clerk.

1900 M. Montgomery, Missouri; A. Frantz, Ohio; J. D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; H. Garber, Ohio; J. D. Musselman, Indiana; E. M. Senseney, Maryland; W. Cassell, G. V. Siler, Ohio; A. Miller, W. S. Noe, Illinois; E. Miller, J. Garber, Ohio; S. Stamy, Iowa. A. Frantz, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; J. D. Benedict, writing clerk.

1901 Andrew Miller, Illinois; G. V. Siler, Ohio; John Garber, Ohio; William S. Noe, Illinois; Henry Garber, Ohio; J. D. Musselman, Indiana; J. D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; George Long, Michigan; Solomon Stamy, Iowa; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; Aaron Frantz, Ohio; Peter Heck, Kansas; William Cassell, Ohio. Aaron Frantz, foreman; Henry Garber, reading clerk; J. D. Benedict, writing celrk.

1902 William Cassell, Ohio; Abram Miller, Indiana; Henry Garber, Ohio; Emanuel Miller, Ohio; Solomon Stamy, Iowa; G. V. Siler, Ohio; George Long, Michigan; John Garber, Ohio; J. D. Musselman, Indiana; E. M. Senseney, Maryland; Abram Fisher, Illinois; Aaron Frantz, Ohio. Aaron Frantz, foreman; Henry Garber, reading clerk; and Ezra M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1903 Aaron Frantz, Ohio; Henry Garber, Ohio; E. M. Senseney, Maryland; John Garber, Ohio; Peter Heck, Kansas; D. S. Miller, Indiana; J. D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; Wm. Cassell, Ohio; Andrew Miller, Illinois; J. D. Musselman, Indiana; Emanuel Miller, Ohio. Aaron Frantz, foreman; Henry Garber, reading clerk; Ezra M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1904 A. Crumpacker, Virginia; E. M. Senseney, Maryland; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; J. D. Musselman, Indiana; H. A. Good, Pennsylvania; Wm. Cassell, Ohio; Andrew Miller, Illinois; John Garber, Ohio; Aaron Frantz, Ohio; Emanuel Miller, Ohio; Abraham Fisher, Illinois; Henry Garber, Ohio. Michael Montgomery, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; E. M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1905 Abraham Crumpacker, Virginia; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; Benjamin D. Flora, Virginia; Ezra M. Senseney, Maryland; Emanuel Miller, Ohio; Andrew Miller, California; John Garber, Ohio; John D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; George Long, Michigan; John D. Musselman, Indiana; Henry Garber, William Cassell, Ohio. Michael Montgomery, foreman; Henry Garber, reading clerk; Ezra M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1906 John Garber, of Ohio; George Long, of Michigan; Emanuel Miller, of Ohio; Henry A. Good, of Pennsylvania; William Cassell, of Ohio; Henry Garber, of Ohio; E. M. Senseney, of Maryland; Aaron Frantz, of Ohio; Michael Montgomery, of Missouri; Isaac P. Stitely, of Maryland; Abram Fisher, of Michigan; J. D. Musselman, of Indiana. Michael Montgomery, foreman; Henry Garber, reading clerk; Ezra M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1907 William Cassell, Ohio; Emanuel Miller, Ohio; Henry A. Good, Pennsylvania; Benj. A. Frantz, Ohio; John Garber, Ohio; John D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Ezra M. Senseney, Maryland; Henry Garber, Ohio; John D. Musselman, Indiana; George W. Balsbaugh, Indiana. Henry Garber, foreman; John Garber, reading clerk; E. M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1908 William Cassell, Ohio; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; John D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Henry Garber, Ohio; Benj. A. Frantz, Ohio; Ezra M. Senseney, Maryland; John Garber, Ohio; John D. Musselman, Indiana; Isaac P. Stitely, Maryland; George W. Balsbaugh, Indiana; Abram Fisher, Michigan; Henry A. Good, Pennsylvania. M. Montgomery, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; E. M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1909 John D. Musselman, George W. Balsbaugh, Indiana; David Flory, Henry Garber, John Garber, Benj. A. Frantz, Ohio; William Cherry, J. B. Rinehart, Kansas; E. M. Senseney, I. P. Stitely, Maryland; J. D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; Levi H. Sides, North Carolina. M Montgomery, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; E. M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1910 Benjamin D. Flora, Virginia; Isaac P. Stitely, Maryland; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; George W. Balsbaugh, Indiana; Wm. Cherry, Kansas; Henry Garber, Ohio; Ezra M. Senseney, Maryland; William Cassell, Ohio; Henry A. Good, Pennsylvania; John Garber, Ohio; John D. Musselman, Indiana; Abram Fisher, Michigan. M. Montgomery, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; E. M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1911 B. D. Flora, Virginia; E. M. Senseney, Maryland; David Flory, Ohio; B. A. Frantz, Ohio; G. W. Balsbaugh, Indiana; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; I. P. Stitely, Maryland; H. A. Good, Pennsylvania; Henry Garber, Ohio; William Cassell, Ohio; John Garber, Ohio; Abram Fisher, Michigan. M. Montgomery, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; E. M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1912 Isaac P. Stitely, Maryland; Ezra M. Senseney, Maryland; Benjamin D. Flora, Virginia; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; Aaron P. Metzger, Indiana; John Garber, Ohio; Abram Fisher, Michigan; William Cassell, Ohio; John D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Henry Garber, Ohio; Benjamin A. Frantz, Ohio; David Flory, Ohio. M. Montgomery, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; E. M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1913 Michael Montgomery, Missouri; Henry Garber, Ohio; John Garber, Ohio; E. M. Senseney, Maryland; Ephraim Brumbaugh, Michigan; Aaron P. Metzger, Indiana; G. W. Balsbaugh, Indiana; B. A. Frantz, Ohio; John D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Benjamin D. Flora, Virginia; Isaac P. Stitely, Maryland; David Flory, Ohio. M. Montgomery, foreman; H. Garber, reading clerk; E. M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1914 Michael Montgomery, Missouri; E. M. Senseney, Maryland; J. D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Aaron P. Metzger, Indiana; David Flory, Ohio; Ephraim Brumbaugh, Michigan; Abram Fisher, Michigan; I. P. Stitely, Maryland; G. W. Balsbaugh, Indiana; John Garber, Ohio; Henry Garber, Ohio; B. A. Frantz, Ohio. Michael Montgomery, foreman; Henry Garber, reading clerk; Ezra M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1915 Michael Montgomery, of Missouri; I. P. Stitely, of Maryland; Henry Garber, of Ohio; E. M. Senseney, of Maryland; John D. Benedict, of Pennsylvania; A. P. Metzger, of Indiana; G. W. Balsbaugh, of Indiana; Ephraim Brumbaugh, of Michigan; B. A. Frantz, of Ohio; David Flory, of Ohio; John Garber, of Ohio; J. D. Mohler, of Ohio: Wm. H. Peters, of Virginia. M. Montgomery, foreman; Henry Garber, reading clerk; E. M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1916 M. Montgomery, Missouri; J: E. Brubaker, Virginia; J. D. Miller, Illinois; B. A. Frantz, Ohio; David Flory, Ohio; J. D. Mohler, Ohio; G. W. Balsbaugh, Indiana; E. M. Senseney, Maryland; J. D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; A. P. Metzger, Indiana; I. P. Stitely, Maryland; Henry Garber, Ohio. Michael Montgomery, foreman; Henry Garber, reading clerk; Ezra M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1917 Moses Plunkett, Kansas; J. D. Miller, Illinois; John F. Flora, Indiana; Henry Garber, Ohio; Abram Fisher, Michigan; G. W. Balsbaugh, Indiana; J. E. Brubaker, Virginia; A. P. Metzger, Indiana; J. D. Mohler, Ohio; Chas. B. Rumble, California; I. P. Stitely, Maryland; J. D. Benedict, Pennsylvania. Henry Garber, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. D. Benedict, writing clerk.

1918 Henry Garber, Ohio; Wm. H. Peters, Va.; Jos. D. Mohler, Ohio; Aaron P. Metzger, John F. Flora, Ind.; Moses Plunkett, Kans.; Chas B. Rumble, Calif.; Jno. D. Benedict, Pa.; Isaac P. Stitley, Md.; Jacob D. Miller, Ill.; Geo. W. Balsbaugh, Ind.; Abram Fisher, Mich. H. Garber, foreman; I. P. Stitley, reading clerk; J. D. Benedict, writing clerk.

1919 Michael Montgomery, Missouri; Jacob D. Miller, Illinois; John F. Flora, Aaron P. Metzger, Geo. W. Balsbaugh, Indiana; Josiah E. Brubaker, Virginia; Josiah B. Rhinehart, Indiana; Henry Garber, Joseph D. Mohler, Ohio; Abram Fisher, Indiana; John D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Isaac P. Stitely, Maryland. M. Montgomery, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. D. Benedict, writing clerk.

1920 Abram Fisher, Indiana; I. P. Stitely, Maryland; J. D. Benedict, Pa.; George W. Balsbaugh, Ind.; Wm. H. Peters, Virginia; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; John F. Flora, Indiana; A. P. Metzger, Indiana; J. B. Rinehart, Indiana; Henry Garber, Ohio; J. D. Miller, Illinois; J. E. Brubaker, Virginia.

1921 John D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Ezra M. Senseney, Isaac P. Stitely, Maryland; Josiah E. Brubaker, Virginia; Josiah B. Rinehart, Aaron P. Metzger, John F. Flora, Abram Fisher, Indiana; Jacob D. Miller, Illinois; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; John B. Wertz, Kansas; Chas. B. Rumble, California, Michael Montgomery, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; E. M. Senseney, writing clerk.

1922 Isaac P. Stitely, Maryland; J. D. Benedict, Pennsylvania; Aaron P. Metzger, Indiana; Josiah B. Rinehart, Indiana; J: E. Brubaker, Virginia; Samuel Leedy, Ohio; William H. Peters, Virginia; Chas. B. Rumble, California; Jacob D. Miller, Illinois; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; J. F. Flora, Indiana; Abram Fisher, Indiana. M. Montgomery, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. D. Benedict, writing clerk; Chas. B. Rumble, assistant clerk.

1923 M. Montgomery, Missouri; Wm. H. Peters, Virginia; J. E. Brubaker, Virginia; I. P. Stitely, Maryland; A. C. Hess, Pennsylvania; G. P. Custer, Ohio; S. Leedy, Ohio; J. F. Flora, Indiana; Abram Fisher, Indiana; J. B. Rinehart, Indiana; J. D. Miller, Illinois; J. B. Wertz, Kansas. M. Montgomery, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. B. Rinehart, writing clerk; A. C. Hess, assistant clerk

1924 M. Montgomery, Missouri; J. B. Flora, Indiana; A. C. Hess, Pennsylvania; A. P. Metzger, Indiana; I. P. Stitely, Maryland; J. B. Wertz, Kansas; I. H. Cool, Ohio; J. B. Rinehart, Indiana; J. E. Brubaker, Virginia; G. P. Custer, Ohio; J. D. Miller, Illinois; Samuel Leedy, Ohio. M. Montgomery, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. B. Rinehart, writing clerk; A. C. Hess, assistant clerk.

1925 Jacob D. Miller, Illinois; Michael Montgomery, Missouri; John B. Wertz, Kansas; Aaron P. Metzger, Indiana; Abram Fisher, Indiana; John F. Flora, Indiana; Paul Custer, Ohio; Samuel Leedy, Ohio; John D. Benedict; Pennsylvania; Isaac P. Stitely, Maryland; Josiah E. Brubaker, Virginia; William H. Peters, Virginia. M. Montgomery, foreman, I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. D. Benedict, writing clerk; J. D. Miller, assistant clerk.

1926 John F. Shaeffer, Lloyd Oyler, Leander Miller, Joel P. Wray, Samuel Leedy, Michael Montgomery, Jacob D. Miller, Wm. H. Peters, Isaac P. Stitely, Chas. B. Rumble, Abram C. Hess, Josiah E. Brubaker, G. Paul Custer. M. Montgomery, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. D. Miller, writing clerk; Chas. B. Rumble, assistant clerk.

1927 John D. Benedict, Jacob D. Miller, Leander Miller, Chas. B. Rumble, Michael Montgomery, John F. Flora, Aaron P. Metzger, G. Paul Custer, Samuel Leedy, Abram C. Hess, Isaac P. Stitely, Josiah E. Brubaker, William H. Peters. M. Montgomery, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. D. Miller, writing clerk; Chas. B. Rumble, assistant clerk.

1928 John F. Shaeffer, J. L. Oyler, Jno. F. Flora, Leander Miller, Samuel Leedy, A. C. Hess, Chas. B. Rumble, M. Montgomery, G. P. Custer, J. D. Miller, Wm. H. Peters, J. E. Brubaker. M. Montgomery, foreman; Jno. F. Flora, reading clerk; A. C. Hess, assistant; J. D. Miller, writing clerk; Chas B. Rumble, assistant.

1929 Leander Miller, G. Paul Custer, Josiah E. Brubaker, John F. Flora, Jacob D. Miller, Abram C. Hess, Michael Montgomery, Samuel Leedy, Isaac P. Stitely, John F. Shaeffer, J. Lloyd Oyler, Chas. B. Rumble. M. Montgomery, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. D. Miller, writing clerk; Chas B. Rumble, assistant clerk

1930 J. D. Miller, J. Lloyd Oyler, C. B. Rumble, I. P. Stitely, Joel P. Wray, Samuel Leedy, C. E. Jamison, A. C. Hess, John F Flora, G. Paul Custer, Albert Balsbaugh, George Bowser. John F. Flora, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. D. Miller, writing clerk; C. B. Rumble, assistant.

1931 Michael Montgomery, Joel P. Wray, Leander Miller, G. P. Custer, C. E. Jamison, A. C. Hess, John F. Flora, Samuel Leedy, John F. Shaeffer, Chas. B. Rumble, J. D. Miller, I. P. Stitely. M. Montgomery, foreman; I. P. Stitely, reading clerk; J. D. Miller, writing clerk; Chas B. Rumble, assistant.

1932 Christian E. Jamison, David A. Montgomery, Harry G. Benedict, G. Paul Custer, Samuel Leedy, John F. Flora, Leander Miller, Jacob D. Miller, Michael Montgomery, Joel P. Wray, John F. Shaeffer, George Bowser. M. Montgomery, foreman; J. F. Flora, assistant; G. P. Custer, reading clerk; J. D. Miller, writing clerk; H. G. Benedict, assistant.

1933 Samuel Leedy, David A. Montgomery, C. E. Jamison, Isaac P. Stitely, Joel P. Wray, George Bowser, J. F. Flora, J. D. Miller, M. Montgomery, Leander Miller, J. W. Skiles, A. C. Hess. Michael Montgomery, foreman; Isaac P. Stitely, reading clerk; Jacob D. Miller, writing clerk.

1934 John F. Flora, Michael Montgomery C. E. Jamison, J. D. Miller, J. W. Skiles, H. G. Benedict, Samuel Leedy, D. A. Montgomery, Leander Miller, J. Lloyd Oyler, S. F. Repp, Edward C. Miller, Solomon Stoner. John F. Flora, foreman; C. E. Jamison, reading clerk; J. W. Skiles, assistant; J. D. Miller, writing clerk; H. G. Benedict, assistant.

1935 Samuel Leedy, J. L. Oyler, David A. Montgomery, Solomon Stoner, John F. Flora, J. D. Miller, C. E. Jamison, J. W. Skiles, Leander Miller, Simeon Frantz, H. G. Benedict, Michael Montgomery. John F. Flora, foreman; C. E. Jamison, reading Clerk; J. W. Skiles, assistant; H. G. Benedict, writing clerk; J. D. Miller, assistant.

1936 John T. Rutrough, Daniel Flory, Christian E. Jamison, Jacob W. Skiles, Jacob D. Miller, Samuel Leedy, Solomon Stoner, David A. Montgomery, Harry G. Benedict, O. A. Custer, Simeon Frantz, John F. Flora. J. W. Skiles, foreman; J. F. Flora, assistant; C. E. Jamison, reading clerk; O. A. Custer, assistant; H. G. Benedict, writing clerk; S. Stoner, assistant.

1937 Jacob W. Skiles, Solomon Stoner, Harry G. Benedict, Jacob D. Miller, David A. Montgomery, Christian E. Jamison, Simeon Frantz, Samuel Leedy, John T. Rutrough, Daniel Flory, Leander Miller, O. A. Custer. J. W. Skiles, foreman; C. E. Jamison, reading clerk; D. Flory, assistant; H. G. Benedict, writing clerk; S. Stoner, assistant. ,

1938 Simeon Frantz, A. C. Hess, Jacob W. Skiles, C. E. Jamison, O. A. Custer, J. T. Rutrough, Daniel Flory, Solomon Stoner, Samuel Leedy, D. A. Montgomery, J. D. Miller, Leander Miller. Jacob W. Skiles, foreman; C. E. Jamison, reading clerk; O. A. Custer, assistant, Solomon Stoner, writing clerk; J. D. Miller, assistant.

1939 Arthur R. King, Jacob W. Skiles, C. E. Jamison, O. A. Custer, Simeon Frantz, Daniel Flory, Edward C. Miller, H. G. Benedict, Solomon Stoner, Jacob D. Miller, John T. Rutrough, Peter D. Bowman. Jacob W. Skiles, foreman; C. E. Jamison, reading clerk; O. A. Custer, assistant; H. G. Benedict, writing clerk; Solomon Stoner, assistant.

1940 J. W. Skiles, Leander Miller, Daniel Flory, C. E. Jamison, Simeon Frantz, H. G. Benedict, A. R. King, P. D. Bowman, Edward C. Miller, J. T. Rutrough, Solomon Stoner, O. A. Custer, Jacob D. Miller. J. W. Skiles, foreman; C. E. Jamison, reading clerk; O. A. Custer, assistant; H. G. Benedict, writing clerk; Solomon Stoner, assistant.

1941 Jacob W. Skiles, Edward C. Miller, Solomon Stoner, Jacob D. Miller, H. G. Benedict, C. E. Jamison, J. T. Rutrough, O. A. Custer, A. R. King, Leander Miller, Daniel Flory, P. D. Bowman. J. W. Skiles, foreman; C. E. Jamison, reading clerk; S. Stoner, assistant; H. G. Benedict, writing clerk; A. R. King, assistant.

1942 J. T. Rutrough, J. D. Miller, C. E. Jamison, Daniel Flory, Edw. C. Miller, P. D. Bowman, A. E. Miller, H. G. Benedict, J. W. Skiles, A. R. King, O. A. Custer, S. Stoner. J. W. Skiles, foreman: C. E. Jamison, reading clerk; S. Stoner, assistant; H. G. Benedict, writing clerk; A. R. King, assistant.

1943 J. W. Skiles, A. R. King, S. Stoner, O. A. Custer, H. G. Benedict, J. D. Miller, A. E. Miller, H. E. Brovont, Daniel Flory, C. E. Jamison, P. D. Bowman, J. T. Rutrough, J. W. Skiles, foreman; C. E. Jamison, reading clerk; S. Stoner, assistant; H. G. Benedict, writing clerk, A. R. King, assistant.

PART V.

COMMITTEES TO CHURCHES

1849 1. Bachelor Run church, Carroll Co., Ind.: Peter Nead, Mich. Moyer, of Montg. Co.; Daniel Miller, of Preble Co., O.

2. The Glades district, Pa. divided by the following: Peter Long, Andrew Spanogle, John Holsinger, Pa.; Joseph Arnold, Jacob Byser, Va.; George Hoke, Henry Kurtz, O.

1850 1. Eel River, Ind.: Peter Nead, David Bowman, Jr., Daniel Miller, Abraham Erbaugh, O.; Jacob Miller, David Hardman, James H. Tracey, of Ind.

1851 1. Knob Creek, Tenn.; Benj. Bowman, John Hershberger, John Kline, Daniel Brower, of Rockingham Co.; B. F. Moomaw, of Roanoke Co., Va.

2. Logan and Shelby Counties, O.: George Shively, Joseph Showalter, of Stark Co.; John Molsbaugh of Knox Co.; Jacob Kurtz, of Wayne Co., O.

3. Salomony, Ind.: John Miller, of Elkhart Co.; Henry Neff, of Turkey Creek; David Shoemaker, of Huntington Co.; Nich. Frantz, of Eel River; Abraham Moss, John Bowman, of Wayne Co., Ind.

4. White Oak, Pa.: Andrew Spanogle, Peter Long, Samuel Lehman, of Pa.; Philip Boyle, Daniel P. Sayler, Md.

5. Frederick Co., Va.: Complaint of Sister Brand: Benj. Bowman, Peter Miller, John Wine, Samuel Wampler, Jacob Biser.

1852 1. Tiffin, Seneca Co.: J. Showalter, of Stark Co.; J. Molsbaugh, of Knox Co.; J. Shoemaker, of Mohican; Elias Dicky, of Ashland Co.; Jacob Kurtz, of Wayne Co., O.

2. Jonathan's Creek, O.: John Molsbaugh, John Shoemaker, of Mohican; J. P. Ebersole, Jacob Kurtz, Henry D. Davy, O.

3. Two districts in Montg. Co., O.: Benj. Bowman, David Hardman, of Ind.; Daniel Miller, of Preble Co.; George Butterbaugh, of Miami Co.; John Frantz, of Clark Co., Mich.; Meyer, of Montg. Co.; Abr. Miller, of Allen Co., O.

4. Church between Salem and Union, Montg. Co., O: George Hoover, of Henry Co.; George W. Studebaker, Daniel Miller, of Four Mile; John Shively, Martin Cable, of Ind.

5. Snake Spring Valley, Pa.: Case of Daniel Zook: Peter Long, of Perry Co.; Andrew Spanogle, of Huntington Co.; Jacob Meyer, of Somerset Co., Pa.; Joseph Arnold, Jacob Biser, of Hampshire Co., Va.

1853 1. Williams County, O.: Jacob Miller, of Portage, Ind.; Abraham Miller, of Allen; John P. Ebersole, of Seneca; and Elias Dicky, of Ashland, all in Ohio.

2. Jonathan's Creek Church, in Ohio: Brethren Geo. Shively, from Stark Co.; John Shoemaker, of Mohican; John P. Ebersole, of Seneca; John Molsbaugh, of Knox; Jacob Kurtz, of Wayne; and Henry Davy, of Delaware County, O., appointed to be said committee.

1854 1. Upper Conowago Church, Pennsylvania: Jacob Sayler, of Maryland; William Boyer, of Franklin; John Berkley, of Somerset; Isaac Meyers, of Union; and Jacob Hollinger, of Dauphin Counties, all in Pennsylvania, nominated as such committee.

2. Coventry Church, Chester County, Pennsylvania: Dan P. Sayler and Philip Boyle, of Maryland; John Kline, of Virginia; and Samuel Harley, Jacob Wenger, and Christian Longenecker, of Pennsylvania.

3. Cumberland Church, in Pennsylvania. Also granted, and Brethren Isaac Pfoutz, of Maryland; Samuel Miller, Peter Long, Andrew Spanogle, and David Bosserman, all of Pennsylvania, nominated for this committee.

1855 1. Tulpehocken, Lebanon County, Pennsylvania: Elders Samuel Harley, Jacob Wenger, Jacob Hollinger, Samuel Miller, and David Gerlach, appointed.

2. Sugar Creek congregation, in Tuscarawas County, O.: Brethren Joseph Showalter, John Shoemaker, Elias Dicky, John Molsbaugh, and Jacob Kurtz, appointed for this visit.

3. Illinois (Far Western Brethren): Abraham Moss, Christian Long, John Metzger, Samuel Lehman, James H. Tracey, David Hardman, John Bowman, Daniel Frey, Daniel P. Sayler, John H. Umstad, James Quinter.

4. A request for a committee to visit the church in Owen County, Indiana. Left over to Elder John Metzger, to go there, with some more brethren (and at least one more elder), to investigate the case.

1856 1. Carroll Co., Ill.: Andrew Spanogle, Samuel Gerber, Daniel Frey, Joseph Emmert, Samuel Lehman.

2. Owl Creek, Knox Co., O.: George Hoke, Elias Dicky, Jacob Gerber, H. D. Davy, J. P. Ebersole.

3. Hunterdon Co., N. J., Coventry and Indian Creek, Pa.: Andrew Spanogle, Peter Long, Pa.; John Kline, J. Wine, Martin Miller, Va.

4. Covington and Highland Co., O.: George Shively, Jas. H. Tracey, Jacob Miller, John Metzger, Geo. Hoover, Jacob Metzger, David Hardman, of Ind.; Peter Nead, Daniel Miller, of Ohio.

1857 1. Swatara Church, in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania: Peter Long, Andrew Spanogle, Sam. Harley, John Glock, John Holsinger, and George Brumbaugh.

2. Monroe County, Iowa: Samuel Lehman, Christ. Long, George Butterbaugh, Dan Frey, John Metzger, Sam Garver, Hiel Hamilton, and John P. Ebersole.

3. Ashland Church, in Ashland County, Ohio: J. P. Ebersole, Joseph Showalter, Henry Davy, Christian Wise, and David Fackler.

4. Clarion County, Pennsylvania: Andrew Spanogle, Abraham Rothrock, David Meyers, Joseph Hanawalt, and John Glock.

5. Ridge Church, in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania: Christian Keefer, Isaac Pfoutz, Jacob Saylor, Philip Boyle, and Geo. Beer.

6. Tulpehocken Church, in Lebanon County, Pennsylvania: The request was granted, and the same committee appointed to visit this church that was appointed to visit the Swatara Church, in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania.

1858 Requests for committees: 1. A request for a committee to visit Conestoga Church, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The request was granted, and the following brethren constitute the committee: John Glock, Samuel Harley, Jacob Hollinger, Daniel Hollinger and Peter Long. 2. A request for a committee to visit Painter Creek Church, Miami County, Ohio. The request was granted, and the following brethren constitute the committee: John P. Ebersole, John Metzger, Elias Dicky, George Shively, Jacob Miller, of Portage; David Hardman, of Indiana; George Hoover, Henry Davy and Abraham Moss. 3. A request for a committee to visit the Owl Creek Church, Knox County, Ohio. The request was granted, and the following brethren constitute the committee: Elias Dickey, Jacob Gerber, Peter Nead, Daniel Miller, John Metzger, and Henry Davy.

1859 Requests for committees: 1. A request for a committee to visit Sugar Creek Church, Tuscarawas County, Ohio, to investigate grievances. The request was granted, and the following brethren constitute the committee: Elias Dicky, Henry Davy, Jacob Garver, of Mohickon, Ohio. 2. A request for a committee to visit Upper Conowago Church, Adams County, Pennsylvania. The request was granted, and the following brethren constitute the committee: Peter Long, Philip Boyle and Christian Keefer.

1860 Request for committees: 1. A request for a committee to visit the Limestone congregation, in Washington County, Tennessee, to settle existing difficulties. The request was granted, and the following brethren constitute the committee: John Wine, Martin Miller, Jacob Miller, Peter Crumpacker, Benjamin Moomaw, Jacob Wine, and Martin Garber. 2. The Annual Meeting ascertaining that difficulties exist in the church in Cedar County, Missouri, appoints the following brethren as a committee to visit said church, and to settle the difficulties: John Metzger, Jacob Brower, and David Brower. 3. A request for a committee to visit the Ridge Church, in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, to investigate grievances therein existing. The request was granted, and the following brethren were appointed on the committee: Henry Koontz, Christian Keefer, George Beer, Peter Long, and David Bosserman.

1861 Kansas, Breckenridge County, etc.: John Metzger, of Indiana, Christian Long, of Illinois, and Samuel Lehman, also of Illinois. 2. Leading Creek,and Dryfork, in Randolph County, Virginia: Joseph Arnold of Hampshire, Jacob Miller, of Rockingham, and Jacob Wine, of Shenandoah, Virginia.

1862 Requests for committees: 1. A committee for Rush Creek Church, Hocking County, Ohio. The following brethren form the committee: John P. Ebersole, Elias Dicky, and H. Davy. 2. A committee to visit the Elk Lick Church, Somerset County, Pennsylvania. John Kline and John Wine were appointed on this committee, with authority to add one to the number.

1863 Requests for committees. 1. Tulpehocken Church, Pennsylvania; granted, and Henry Kurtz, Peter Long, John G. Glock, and Isaac Myer, appointed. 2. A committee for Lower Shenandoah Church, Virginia; granted, and Henry Kurtz, Henry Davy, Jacob Wine, John Kline, Daniel P. Sayler, and Daniel Thomas, nominated.

1864 Requests for committees. 1. Appanoose, Iowa: David Brower, Jacob Brower, John Murray, and Jacob Waters.

1865 Requests for committees: 1. The following brethren constitute the committee to the Beaver Dam Church, Maryland: H. D. Davy, J. P. Ebersole, John Wise, and Jos. R. Hanawalt. 2. For Kansas: Christian Long and J. Metzger. 3. For Jasper County, Iowa: Christian Long, Jacob Berkey, John Metzger, and

J. P. Ebersole. 4. For Berlin, Somerset County, Pennsylvania: H. D. Davy, J. P. Ebersole, and John Wise. 5. For the Wabash Church, Indiana: Jacob Miller, of Portage; Daniel B. Sturgis, Hiel Hamilton, and John Bowman. 6. For Bourbon, Indiana: Abraham Whitmer, Christian Wenger, David Ruple, and John Nisely. 7. For Salamony Church, Indiana: H. D. Davy, J. P. Ebersole, Jacob Miller, of Portage, and John Metzger.

1866 Requests for committees: 1. For a committee to visit the White Oak Church, in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The following brethren are on this committee: Joseph Hanawalt, Moses Miller, Isaac Meyers, Daniel Keller, and Andrew Miller. 2. For a committee to visit the Swatara Church, Lebanon County, Pennsylvania. David Gerlach, Moses Miller, Andrew Miller, and Daniel Keller. 3. For a committee to visit the Antietam Church, Franklin County, Pennsylvania. H. D. Davy, John P. Ebersole, John Wise, John M. Holsinger, and John G. Glock.

1867 The following committees were appointed by the meeting by request: 1. A committee to visit the Paint Creek and White Oak churches in southern Ohio. The following brethren were appointed: H. D. Davy, J. P. Ebersole, John Hershey, John Frantz, Peter Nead, and James Quinter. 2.For Cherry Grove, Carroll County, Illinois: Samuel Gerber, Michael Sisler, and Martin Myers. 3. For the Brush Creek Church, Maryland: David Long, David Bosserman, and Henry Koontz. 4. For the Ridge Church, Cumberland County, Pennsylvania: Moses Miller, D. Bosserman, J. G. Glock, Joseph Hanawalt, and Andrew Miller. 5. For New Hope Church, Augusta County, Virginia, Daniel Thomas, Jacob Miller, and Isaac Long. 6. For Otter Creek Church, Macoupin County, Illinois: J. R. Gish, John Fitz, Jacob Negley.

1868 The following committees were appointed by the standing committee: 1. For Marshall County, Indiana, Yellow River Church: Jacob Miller, of Portage; Jacob Berkey, and David Bechtelheimer. 2. For Tippecanoe Church, Indiana: Abraham Erbaugh, David Miller, Jacob Miller, Jacob Flory, Jacob Berkey, and F. P. Loehr. 3. The same committee will go to Eel River congregation, Indiana. 4. For Cedar Creek congregation, DeKalb County, Indiana: Daniel Brower, Allen County, Ohio; Jacob Wagner, Joseph McCarty, and John Brown. 5. For Macoupin County, Illinois: John Metzger, Christian Long, Henry Davy, Joseph Hendricks, and Samuel Lehman. 6. For Marshall County, Iowa: John Wise, Samuel Gerber, George Baker, and Elias K. Beeghly. 7. For Philadelphia and Germantown: D.

P. Sayler, H. D. Davy, James Quinter, Daniel Thomas, and Moses Miller. 8. For Salamony Church, Indiana: H. D. Davy, Daniel Brower, John P. Ebersole, John Metzger, and Jacob Berkey. 9. A committee to Somerset County, Pennsylvania: Tobias Blouch, Abraham Stutzman, and D. M. Holsinger. 10. A committee to the Rock Run and Elkhart churches, Indiana: H. D. Davy, Daniel Miller, J. P. Ebersole, John Metzger, and Michael Shotz. 11. To the Newton Church, Miami County, Ohio: Nathan Haywood, George Holler, Joseph Resor, and Isaac Miller. 12. To Pine Creek Church, Indiana: Jacob Berkey, Christ. Wenger, Ab. Witmer, and Jacob Miller. 13. To Waddam's Grove, Illinois: Michael Sisler, Martin Meyers, and David E. Price.

1869 Request for committees: 1. A request from the Miami Church, Ohio. The request was granted, and the following brethren appointed: J. P. Ebersole, Daniel Brower, Joseph Kauffman, and Jacob Garver. 2. A committee for the Bush Creek Church, Maryland, was requested and granted, and the following brethren were appointed: H. D. Davy, John Wise, David Long, and Joseph F. Rohrer. 3. The following brethren were appointed as a committee to visit the Antioch Church, Indiana: H. D. Davy, David Bechtelheimer, Daniel Brower, Jacob Berkey, and J. Miller, of Portage. 4. The following brethren were appointed a committee to Fawn River, Indiana: Jacob Miller, of Portage; Jacob Berkey, and Christian Wenger. 5. The following brethren were appointed a committee to visit the church in Bedford County, Pennsylvania: Grabill Myers, Jacob Price, and Moses Miller. 6. The following brethren form the committee to Tennessee to organize a church: Abraham Naff, David Derrick, and B. F. Moomaw. 7. The following brethren were appointed to visit the Prices Creek Church, Ohio: Peter Nead, H. D. Davy, and Isaac Miller.

1870 In compliance with the requests made, the following committees were appointed: 1. To the Cold Water Church, Butler County, Iowa: David Brower, Henry Strickler, and Peter Forney. 2. To the Eel River and Washington churches, Indiana: Hiel Hamilton, Jacob Wagner, and Jacob Flory. 3. To the Rock River, West Branch, and Yellow Creek churches, Illinois: H. D. Davy, John Wise and John Metzger. 4. To the Rush Creek Church, Ohio: H. D. Davy, James Quinter, John Wise, J. P. Ebersole, and Eli Stoner. 5. To the Georges Creek Church, Pennsylvania: H. D. Davy, John Wise, and C. G. Lint. 8. To the Snake Spring Valley Church, Pennsylvania; Joseph Hanawalt, John Gluck, Isaac Myers, Moses Miller, and J. Berkey.

1871 Calls for committees: 1. A request for a committee to visit the West Branch Church, in Darke County, Ohio, to settle difficulties. This was granted, and the following brethren were appointed: H. D. Davy, James Quinter, Samuel Mohler. 2. A request for a committee to visit the Pine Creek Church, Ogle County, Illinois, for the same purpose. This was granted, and the following brethren constitute the committee: Samuel Lehman, Martin Myers, and Michael Sisler. 3. For a committee to the West Conestoga and Chiques Creek churches, in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, to settle difficulties. The following are the brethren appointed: Joseph R. Hanawalt, Samuel Lehman, Daniel Fry, John G. Gluck, John Metzger, and F. P. Loehr. 4. A request for a committee to visit the Sugar Creek Church, Allen County, Ohio. The following brethren were appointed: Abraham Erbaugh, Abraham Flory, John Brilhart, Noah Henricks, and Samuel Mohler. 5. A request for a committee to visit the Milmine Church, in Piatt County, Illinois, to settle difficulties in said church. The following brethren were appointed: J. R. Gish, George Gish, Daniel Nehr, and D. M. Holsinger. 6. A request from the Limestone Church, Washington County, Tennessee, to settle difficulties. The following brethren were appointed on the committee: Peter Crumpacker, Abraham Neff, and B. F. Moomaw. 7. For Elkhart Valley congregation for the same purpose. Jacob Berkey, C. Wenger, Jacob Miller, of Portage; D. B. Stutsman, and A. Whitmore.

1872 Requests for committees to visit churches, to settle difficulties, and which were granted: 1. A committee to the Shanesville Church, Tuscarawas County, Ohio: John P. Ebersole, Samuel Mohler, and Daniel Brower. 2. For the Donnel's Creek Church, Clarke County, Ohio: John Wise, John Metzger, Joseph Hendricks, Heil Hamilton, and R. H. Miller. 3. For the Beaver Dam Church, Frederick County, Maryland: Moses Miller, Daniel Keller, and Jacob Price. 4. For the Beaver Creek Church, Washington County, Maryland: D. P. Sayler, Jacob Price, and Joseph Rohrer. 5. For the Spring River Church, Jasper County, Missouri; also, for the Cedar Creek Church, Cedar County, Missouri, and perhaps for other churches: William Gish, Christian Holler, Isaac Harshey, John Harshey, and Enoch Eby. 6. For the Salem Church, Montgomery County, Ohio, Samuel Mohler, Isaac Miller, and Samuel Garber. 7. For the church on the north branch of the Wild Cat, Indiana: H. D. Davy, John Wise, and Joseph McCarty. 8. For the Chique's Creek Church, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, and the Indian Creek Church, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania: D. P. Sayler, Joseph Hanawalt, J. G. Gluck, Daniel Keller, and Samuel Lehman. 9. For the Chippeway Church, Wayne County, Ohio: Joseph Rittenhouse, Jacob Garver, Conrod Kayler. 10. For the St. Joseph Church, St. Joseph County, Indiana; Bloomingdale Church, Michigan; Elkhart Valley Church, Indiana;Solomon's Creek Church, Indiana; Antioch Church, Indiana; and the Salamony Church, Indiana: D. P. Sayler, J. Wise, H. D. Davy, C. Long, B. F. Moomaw, J. Quinter, and Daniel Brower. 11. For Hurricane Church, Bond County, Illinois: Joseph Henricks, David Wolf, Daniel Nehr. 12. For the Silver Creek Church, Ogle County, Illinois: John Metzger, Enoch Eby, and Samuel Lehman. 13. For the Owl Creek Church, Knox County, Ohio: Samuel Mohler, James Quinter, David Long, A. Flory, and Daniel Brower. 14. For Fall Creek Church, Highland County, Ohio: H. D. Davy, J. Quinter, and J. Frantz.

1873 Requests for committees to visit churches to settle difficulties, and which were granted: 1. Inasmuch as the elder of the Spring Creek Church, in Lebanon County, Pennsylvania, called for assistance to settle difficulties in said church, we grant them the following committee: D. Gerlach, C. Bombarger, and Samuel Harley, of Ephrata. 2. A request from the Upper Deer Creek Church, Cass County, Indiana. The request was granted, and the following brethren were selected: Joseph McCarty, John E. Shively, and Gotleib Keller. 3. A request for a committee to go to Indian Creek Church, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. The request was granted, and the following brethren were appointed: Moses Miller, D. P. Sayler, Daniel Keller, J. G. Glock, and Jacob Price. 4. A committee to Salamony and Antioch churches, Huntington County, Indiana, consisting of H. D. Davy Daniel Brower, and John Wise. 5. A request for a committee to go to Astoria Church, Fulton County, Illinois. The request was granted, and the following brethren were appointed: H. D. Davy, R. H. Miller, John Metzger, and E. Eby. 6 a request from the Yellow Creek Church, Bedford County, Pennsylvania. Request granted, and the following brethren were appointed: Isaac Myers, Jacob Price, and J. G. Glock. 7. A request from the Black River congregation, Van Buren County, Michigan, for a committee. The request was granted, and the following brethren were appointed: Jacob

Berkey, H. D. Davy, and D. B. Sturgis. 8. A request from the Waterloo Church to settle difficulties. The request was granted, and the following brethren were appointed: Henry Strickler, Peter Forney, A. Stamy, and Thomas Snyder.

1874 Call for committees: 1. A request for a committee to visit the White Oak Church, Brush Creek Church, Clear Creek Church, and Fall Creek Church, in Highland and Adams counties, Ohio. The following brethren were appointed: H. D. Davy, Samuel Mohler, J. Wise, R. H. Miller, and D. Brower. 2. Request for a committee to visit the Newton Church, in Miami County, Ohio. The following committee were appointed: R. H. Miller, J. Wise, D. Brower, Jos. N. Kauffman, and Daniel Bowman. 3. Request for a committee to visit the church in Botetourt County, Virginia. The following brethren were appointed: D. P. Sayler, H. D. Davy, D. Long, C. G. Lint, and M. Miller. 4. Request for a committee to visit the Washington Creek Church, Douglas County, Kansas. The following brethren were appointed: John Hershey, John Forney, and Jesse Studebaker. 5. Request for a committee to visit the Deer Creek Church, Indiana. The following brethren were appointed: R. H. Miller, Jesse Meyers, and Jacob Berkey. 6. Request for a committee to visit the North Manchester Church, Indiana. The following brethren were appointed: H. D. Davy, R. H. Miller, John Wise, D. Brower, and D. B. Sturgis. 7. The following brethren form the committee sent to California: H. D. Davy, D. P. Sayler, and B. F. Moomaw. 8. The following brethren form the committee to publish the minutes: H. D. Davy and J. Quinter. 9. Request for a committee to go to St. Joseph County, Indiana. The following brethren were appointed: H. D. Davy, R. H. Miller, and J. Metzger. 10. Request for a committee to visit the Vermillion Church, in Livingston County, Illinois. The following brethren were appointed: Jos. Hendricks, Enoch Eby, and D. Fry. 11. Request for a committee to visit the Indian Creek Church, in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. The following brethren were appointed: H. D. Davy, D. Long, D. Keller, D. Garlach, and C. G. Lint.

1875 Committees to visit churches: 1. A committee to settle difficulties relative to Bourbon College. The following brethren constitute said committee: Hiel Hamilton, Robert H. Miller, John Metzger, H. D. Davy, and J. P. Ebersole. The same committee will go to the Tippecanoe Church, Indiana. 2. A committee to visit the Philadelphia Church. The following brethren are on this committee: H. D. Davy, J. Quinter, Moses Miller,

C. Bucher, and Jos. R. Hanawalt. 3. A committee to visit the church in Ogle County, Illinois, that called for a committee. The following brethren are on this committee: Daniel Fry, E. Eby, David E. Price, Daniel Deardorf, and James R. Gish.

1876 Committees to visit churches: 1. A committee to visit Dry Valley Church, Mifflin County, Pennsylvania. The following brethren constitute the committee: John Gluck, Solomon Seiber, and Geo. Brumbaugh. 2. The following brethren are a committee to go to the West Nimishillen Church, Stark County, Ohio: R. H. Miller, Daniel Brower, and J. P. Ebersole. 3. The following brethren are a committee to go to the English River Church, Iowa: E. K. Beeghly, Peter Forney, and M. Sisler. 4. In compliance with a request from the Georges Creek Church, Fayette County, Pennsylvania, for a committee, the following brethren were appointed: D. P. Sayler, John Wise, and J. Quinter. 5. The following brethren are a committee to the Welsh Run Church, Pennsylvania: D. P. Sayler, J. D. Trostle, and Jacob Price. 6. The following brethren are a committee to the Antietam Church, Franklin County, Pennsylvania: D. Long, D. Keller, and Daniel Eckerman.

1877 Requests for committees: 1. For Falls City Church, Nebraska: Daniel Sell, Henry Brubaker, and William Gish. 2. For Waterloo Church, Iowa: Daniel Holsinger, of Iowa, Henry Strickler, and Joseph Ogg. 3. For South Bend Church, Indiana; R. H. Miller, Enoch Eby, John P. Ebersole, James Quinter, and John Metzger. 4. For Jonathan's Creek, Ohio: Daniel Brower, Samuel Garber, and Morgan Workman. 5. For Sugar Creek, Ohio: R. H. Miller, Enoch Eby, and Jacob Berkey, 6. For North Manchester Church, Indiana: Jacob Berkey, George Hoover, and Daniel Brower. 7. For Northern Indiana, to attend to troubles connected with Salem College: R. H. Miller, Enoch Eby, J. P. Ebersole, and J. Quinter. 8. For Linnville and Flat Rock congregations, Virginia: Moses Miller, David Long, and J. H. Lemon. 9. For Berlin, Pennsylvania: D. P. Sayler, J. W. Brumbaugh, and J. Quinter. 10. For Swanton, Church, Ohio: Daniel Brower, John Brillhart, and Morgan Workman. 11. For Upper Dublin Church, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania: Jas. Quinter, William Hartzler, Henry Cassel, and Samuel Harley. 12. For Yellow Creek and Snake Spring Valley congregations, Bedford County, Pennsylvania: John S. Holsinger, Joseph Berkey, and George Brumbaugh, of James Creek. 13. Inasmuch as the committee appointed for the Botetourt Church, Virginia, in 1876, have not settled the difficulties in said church, we appoint as a committee the following brethren to settle the difficulties: D. P. Sayler, Isaac Long, Solomon Garber, Jacob Wine, and Martin Garber .

1878 Requests for committees: 1. For Antioch Church, Huntington County, Indiana: John Wise, James Quinter, Jeremiah Gump, and J. W. Cripe. 2. For Rock Grove Church, Floyd County, Iowa: John Wise, John Murray, and Robert Badger. 3. For Lost Creek Church, Miami County, Ohio: R. H. Miller, Daniel Brower, Enoch Eby, C. G. Lint, and James Quinter. 4. For Eel River Church, Indiana: R. H. Miller, Daniel Brower, and David Bechtelheimer. 5. For Cook's Creek Church, Virginia: David Long, C. G. Lint, and Moses Miller. 6. For the churches in California: R. H. Miller, J. Quinter, and E. K. Beeghly. 7. For Luney's Church, West Virginia: C. G. Lint, J. D. Trostle, Jacob Wine, and Elias Auvil. 8. For Lower Deer Creek Church, Indiana: Daniel Brower, John H. Caylor, and George Hoover. 9. For making the proposed change in the manner of holding the Annual Meeting: R. H. Miller, Daniel Brower, Enoch Eby, James Quinter, C. G. Lint, Samuel Mohler, and Samuel Garber. ‑0. For Rock Creek Church, in Northern Illinois: Enoch Eby, J. R. Gish, Daniel Fry, and John Emert. 11. For the Beaver Creek Church, Greene County, Ohio. The same committee as for the Lost Creek Church. 12. For the Painter Creek Church, Ohio: Samuel Mohler, Samuel Garber, and George Holler. 13. For the Huntington Church, Indiana: R. H. Miller, Samuel Mohler, G. W. Cripe, and J. W. Stein. 14. For the Meyersdale Church, Pennsylvania: David Long, Moses Miller, J. S. Holsinger, J. W. Brumbaugh, and S. A. Fike.

1879 Requests for committees: 1. For Orrville Church, Wayne County, Ohio: Morgan Workman, J. P. Ebersole, Conrad Kahler. 2. For Welsh Run congregation, Maryland: Daniel Eckerman, Daniel Keller, William Howe. 3. For Otto Creek and Pleasant Hill churches, Macoupin County, Illinois: R. H. Miller, J. Quinter, Jesse Calvert. 4. For Bear Creek congregation, Montgomery County, Ohio: R. H. Miller, J. P. Ebersole, Daniel Brower, Jacob Rife, David Bowman. 5. For Eastern District of Maryland: R. H. Miller, C. G. Lint, J. Quinter, Daniel Keller, William Hertzler. 6. For English River, Middle Creek, and Deep River churches, Iowa: John Wise, E. Eby, Stephen Johnson, J. F. Eikenberry, Samuel Musselman. 7. For Thornapple and Woodland churches, Michigan: Daniel Brower, Jesse Calvert, J. P. Ebersole. 8. To carry out Article 16th, E. Eby, George Hoover, Christian Bucher.

1880 Requests for committees: 1. For Urbana Church, in Champaign County, Illinois: E. Eby, J. Wise, and J. Metzger. 2. For Ephrata Church, in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania: Moses Miller, Christian Bucher, and Henry Cassel. 3. For Conemaugh Church, in Cambria County, Pennsylvania: J. Quinter, J. W. Brumbaugh, and L. Kimmell. 4. For Astoria Church, in Fulton County, Illinois: R. H. Miller, D. France and J. R. Gish. 5. For Ashland Church, Ashland County, Ohio: R. H. Miller, E. Eby, and J. Calvert. 6. For Antietam Church, Franklin County, Pennsylvania: R. H. Miller, J. Quinter, and C. G. Lint. 7. For Macoupin County, Illinois: R. H. Miller, J. Quinter, J. Calvert, E. Eby, and J. Wise. 8. For Rock Creek Church, Whiteside County, Illinois: E. Eby, J. R. Gish, and J. J. Emmert. 9. For Arnold's Grove Church, Carroll County, Illinois: E. Eby, D. E. Price, and D. Deardorf. 10. For North Manchester, Indiana: R. H. Miller, D. Brower, and J. Rife. 11. For Sandbrook, New Jersey, D. P. Sayler, R. H. Miller Moses Miller, C. Bucher, and S. Harley. 12. For the Eastern District of Maryland: R. H. Miller, J. Quinter, and C. G. Lint. 13. For Massisinoway Church, Indiana; J. Rife, George Cripe, and J. Kaylor. 14. For Eel River Church, Indiana: J. Reiff, G. Cripe, and Joseph Leedy. 15. For Yellow Creek and Elkhart Valley churches, Indiana: J. Rife, D. Bechtelheimer, and Joseph Leedy. 16. For Sugar Creek and Layafette churches, Ohio: R. H. Miller, E. Eby, and J. Calvert. 17. For Buffalo Valley Church, Pennsylvania, to carry out a resolution of Annual Meeting of 1879, in regard to Brother P. Beaver: R. H. Miller, J. Quinter, and Grabill Myers.

1881 Requests for committees: 1. For Bear Creek Church, Montgomery County, Ohio, to carry out decision of former committee, R. H. Miller, D. Brower, J. P. Ebersole, Jacob Rife, and I. J. Rosenberger. 2. For Wolf Creek Church, Montgomery County, Ohio, the same as above. 3. For Bear Creek Church, Ohio: D. P. Sayler, D. Long, and C. G. Lint. 4. To settle difficulties between two brethren, one in North Manchester, and one in Eel River Church, Indiana: Jacob Rife, G. W. Cripe, and J. H. Miller. 5. For Amwell Church, New Jersey: D. P. Sayler, R. H. Miller, Christian Bucher, John Wise, and J. Quinter. 6. For Cold Water and Maquoketa churches, Iowa: John Thomas, Robert Badger, and Michael Sisler. 7. For Waddam's Grove Church, Illinois, R. H. Miller, J. Wise, and Daniel Vaniman. 8. For Ashland, Ohio, called by S. Z. Sharp, John Wise, E. Eby, Joseph Kauffman, and I. J. Rosenberger. 9. For

Middle Fork Church, Indiana: R. H. Miller, Daniel Bowman, and George Hoover. 10. For Conemaugh Church, Pennsylvania: J. Wise, C. G. Lint, L. Kimmel, J. W. Brumbaugh, and James Quinter. 11. For Stillwater Church, Ohio: D. Long, and C. G. Lint. 12. For Berlin Church, Pennsylvania, J. Wise: E. Eby, C. Bucher, D. Long, and Joseph Kauffman.

1885 The Bachelor Run Church, Carroll Co., Ind., granted. Daniel Brower, Samuel Murray, William Cassel, and Emanuel Hoover of Ohio, and Enoch Fry of Indiana.

1888 THE WEST. Brothers S. Murray, Ohio, and A. Crumpacker, Virginia were sent to Wyoming Territory and Oregon to set in order what is wanting.

THE NORTHWEST. Brothers George Miller, Ohio, and Solomon Stamy, Iowa, were sent to the brethren of Dunn County, Wisconsin.

1889 To rectify some mistakes made during the year, a committee consisting of S. Murray, A. Frantz, G. V. Siler, of Ohio; A. Crumpacker, of Virginia; and A. Flora, of Indiana, were authorized to go to southwestern Missouri.

1890 North Manchester Church, Wabash County, Indiana: Samuel Murray, Aaron Frantz, Joseph Arnold, John Kimmel, David Flory.

Union City Church, Darke County, Ohio: H. D. Davy, G. V. Siler, Joseph Arnold, John Kimmel, Henry Garber.

1893 Samuel Murray, Aaron Frantz, and Henry Garber were appointed to visit the Cerro Gordo Church, Illinois, and the brethren in Macoupin County, Illinois.

M. Montgomery, Missouri; S. Murray, Ohio; Abraham Flora, Indiana, were appointed to visit the Eight Mile Church, Kansas.

Abraham Flora, Indiana, and George Long, Michigan, will look after the interests of the brethren in Wisconsin and Idaho.

S. Murray and G. V. Siler were appointed to go to California and build up and comfort the church in the extreme west.

1895 The following brethren are to visit the church at Olathe, Kansas: Samuel Murray, William Cassell, J. M. Mohler.

The brethren as named below, are to look after the wants in the church at Bachelor Run, Flora, Indiana: S. Murray, William Cassell, J. M. Mohler, G. V. Siler, A. Frantz.

The following brethren are to visit the Mexico Church, Miami County, Indiana: A. Frantz, G. V. Siler, S. Murray, Wm. Cassell, J. M. Mohler.

1897 Aaron Frantz, Henry Garber, and William Cassell were named to go to Montgomery County, Virginia, and attend to the wants of members there.

1898 To help settle some matters in the Mount Pleasant Church, Jasper County, Indiana, Brethren Henry Garber, Emanuel Miller, and Aaron Frantz are to go there, when convenient, and give them their aid.

1905 A petition to Yearly Meeting from the Antietam congregation, Franklin County, Pennsylvania, for a committee, was granted, and the following brethren were appointed to visit said church and set in order the things that are wanting: John Garber, G. W. Balsbaugh, M. Montgomery, J. D. Mohler, Benjamin D. Flora.

1908 1. For the Donnels Creek Church, Clark County, Ohio: Michael Montgomery, J. D. Benedict, Ezra M. Senseney, George W. Balsbaugh, Aaron P. Metzger.

2. For the Middle Fork Church, Clinton County, Indiana, Michael Montgomery, J. D. Benedict, Ezra M. Senseney, Ephraim Brumbaugh, Abram Fisher.

1909 A request from adjoining elders of the Willow Springs and other churches for a committee to investigate difficulties existing there.

This standing committee decides to grant said request and suggests that the committee be composed of Brethren Henry Garber, George W. Balsbaugh, Aaron P. Metzger, John B. Gascho, Joseph D. Mohler.

1910 A request of the Modesto Church, California, in conjunction with the Whittier Church, California, was presented and granted, and the following named brethren were chosen as their committee: Henry Garber, Joseph D. Mohler, and Abram Fisher.

A request for a committee to investigate trouble existing in the Big Creek Church, Gove County, Kansas, was granted, and the following brethren compose the committee: Henry Garber, Jos. D. Mohler, Abram Fisher.

Should any one of said committee fail to go, Brother G. W. Balsbaugh is to be substituted.

1917 1. For the Donnels Creek, Upper Twin Creek, and Lower Twin Creek Churches, Ohio: G. W. Balsbaugh, E. M. Senseney, M. Montgomery, I. P. Stitely, J. B. Rinehart.

2. For the Shoal Creek Church, Missouri: J. D. Miller, J. F. Flora, A. P. Metzger.

1920 Lower and Upper Twin Churches, Preble Co., O.: John F. Flora, of Ind.; Aaron P. Metzger, of Ind.; Jacob D. Miller of Ill.; John D. Benedict of Pa.; John B. Wertz, of Kans.

1922 Two petitions for committees, one for Upper Twin Church and one for Wolf Creek Church, Ohio, were granted and one committee was appointed for both churches, viz., Michael Montgomery, Isaac P. Stitely, Abram C. Hess, Christian E. Jamison, Aaron P. Metzger. Joseph L. Fisher was named a substitute.

1923 New River Church, Whittier, Calif.: Elders J. F. Flora, G. P. Custer and A. C. Hess. For substitutes Elders J. B. Rinehart and J. B. Wertz were named.

1925 1. For Beech Grove church, Madison Co., Indiana: Paul Custer, Simeon Frantz, Joel P. Wray, George Bowser, Isaac P. Stitely. For substitute: Ira Metzger.

2. For the Wolf Creek Church, Montgomery Co., Ohio: Paul Custer, Simeon Frantz, Joel P. Wray, Isaac P. Stitely, Ira Metzger. For substitute: Joseph L. Fisher.

1926 A request for a committee for the Middle Fork Church, Indiana, was granted, and the following brethren were appointed: I. P. Stitely, C. B. Rumble, M. Montgomery, W. S. Noe, Wm. H. Peters. For substitute: A. C. Hess.

1927 Requests for committees: 1. For the Beaverdam congregation, Maryland: Charles B. Rumble, John F. Flora, Aaron P. Metzger. Substitute, G. P. Custer. 2. For the Middle Fork congregation, near Rossville, Indiana: C. E. Jamison, A. C. Hess, J. D. Miller, J. Lloyd Oyler, J. M. Wagoner. Substitute: J. T. Rutrough.

1930 A petition to A. M. of 1930 for a committee to investigate and settle matters that are disturbing the peace in the Wolf Creek Church, Montgomery Co., Ohio, was granted and the following named brethren were appointed on this committee: J. D. Miller, J. F. Flora, C. E. Jamison, Leander Miller, Simeon Frantz. Substitute, Ira Metzger.

A request from the Willow Springs district, Douglas Co., Kansas, for a committee from A. M. of 1930 to adjust differences there, was granted and the following named brethren appointed on such committee: Samuel Leedy, G. P. Custer, Edward C. Miller. Substitute, Jos. L. Fisher.

1931 A petition for a committee to adjust difficulties in the Cedar Creek Church, Anderson Co., Kanses, was granted and the following elders were appointed as the committee:

Chas. B. Rumble, O. A. Custer, Ira Metzger, J. A. Cover, J. M. Wagoner. For substitute, Simeon Frantz.

1932 Cedar Creek Anderson Co., Kansas: George Bowser, J. W. Stull, Simeon Frantz, J. W. Skiles, J. T. Rutrough, with Isaac Cable, substitute.

Palestine, Darke Co., Ohio: John F. Flora, Jos. L. Fisher, C. E. Jamison, with U. F. Brubaker, substitute.

1933 In order to restore peace in the Genesee district, Michigan, and in the Ash Grove District, Ohio, where discord exists, the Standing Committee concluded to send said districts a committee of investigation composed of the following elders: John F. Flora, Christian E. Jamison, John T. Rutrough, Samuel F. Repp, and David A. Montgomery. Substitute, John S. Jamison. This committee was approved by the meeting.

1934 Petitions for committees to local churches were granted as follows:

For the Palestine Church, Darke County, Ohio: O. A. Custer, A. C. Hess, Leander Miller, J. T. Rutrough, H. G. Benedict. Substitute: Joel Montgomery.

For the Wood Colony Church, Modesto, Calif.: J. L. Oyler, J. W. Skiles, Solomon Stoner, C. E. Jamison, Simeon Frantz. Substitute: W. T. Hess.

For the New River church, Whittier, Calif., the same committee as for the church at Modesto, Calif.

PART VI.

TIME AND PLACE OF ANNUAL MEETINGS

The locations of many of the early Annual Meetings are unknown and the minutes of a large number of them also are either unrecorded or lost. The following list to the year 1830 is according to the one in Brumbaugh's History of The Brethren which gives the place of meeting as far as known till that year. After 1830 the list is based on information recorded on the minutes and other records, and is complete.

1742, Coventry (?) Pa.
1777, Conestoga, Pa.
1778, Pipe Creek, Md.
1779, Conestoga, Pa.
1780, Conestoga, Pa.
1781, Conestoga, Pa.
1785, Big Conestoga, Pa.
1787, Pipe Creek, Md.
1789, Great Conewago, Pa.
1790, Coventry, Pa.
1791, Germantown (?) Pa.
1794, Shenandoah, Va. (Oct. 30.)
1797, Black Water, Va. (Autumn.)
1798, Little Conewago, Pa.
1799, Pipe Creek, Md.
1804, Pipe Creek, Md.
1810, Antietam M. H., Pa.
1813, Coventry, Pa.
1814, Pipe Creek, Md.
1815, White Oak, Pa.
1819, Great Conewago, Pa.
1820, Conestoga, Pa.
1822, Near Canton, Ohio
1825, Morrison's Cove, Pa.
1826, Dan'l Richard's, Washington Co., Md.
1827, Dan'l Shoemaker's, Lancaster Co., Pa.
1828, Bro. Gungle's, York Co., Pa.
1829, George Royer's, Antietam, Pa.
1830, Pipe Creek, Md. (See Brumbaugh's History of The Brethren, p 491

1831, Conestoga, Pa.
1832, Rockingham, Co., Va.
1833, Lost Creek, Juniata Co., Pa.
1834, Stark Co., Ohio
1835, Cumberland Co., Pa.
1836, Cumberland Co., Pa.
1837, Linwell's Creek, Rockingham Co., Va.
1838, Washington Co., Md.
1839, Aughwick, Huntingdon Co., Pa.
1840, Morrison's Cove, Bedford Co., Pa.
1841, William Miller's, Somerset Co., Pa.
1842, Beaver Dam, Frederick Co., Md.
1843, John Shoemaker's, Mohican, Wayne Co., O.
1844, Peter Deardorff's, York Co., Pa.
1845, Daniel Barnhart's, Roanoke Co., Va.
1846, John Royer's, Trout Creek, Lanc. Co., Pa.
1847, Isaac Deardorff's, Franklin Co., Pa.
1848, Jacob Kurtz's, Wayne Co., Ohio.
1849, Somerset Co., Pa.
1850, Bear Creek, Montgomery Co., Ohio
1851, New Hope, Augusta Co., Va.
1852, Turkey Creek, Elkhart Co., Ind.
1853, Beaver Dam, Frederick Co., Md.
1854, Ashland Co., Ohio
1855, Aughwick, Huntingdon Co., Pa.
1856, Michael Raber's, Stephenson Co., Ill.
1857, Washington Co., Md.
1858, Bachelor Run, Carroll Co., Ind.
1859, Elk Creek, Somerset Co., Pa.
1860, Limestone, Washington Co., Tenn.
1861, Beaver Creek, Rockingham Co., Va.
1862, Wolf Creek, Montgomery Co., Ohio
1863, Clover Creek, Blair Co., Pa.
1864, Nettle Creek, Wayne Co., Ohio
1865, Antietam, Franklin Co., Pa.
1866, Rock River, Stephenson Co., Ill.
1867, Pipe Creek, Carroll Co., Md.
1868, Elkhart Co., Ind.
1869, Peters Creek, Va.
1870, Waterloo, Black Hawk Co., Iowa
1871, Berks Co., Pa.
1872, Wayne Co., Ohio
1873, Elk Lick, Somerset Co., Pa.

1874, Joseph Filbrun's, Macoupin Co., Ill.
1875, Covington, Miami Co., Ohio
1876, Degraff, Logan Co., Ohio
1877, New Enterprise, Pa.
1878, N. Manchester, Ind.
1879, Broadway, Va.
1880, Lanark, Ill.
1881, Ashland, Ohio

Special General Conferences

1846, Washington Co., East Tennessee, Sept. 4.
1848, John Koontz's, Delphi, Carroll Co., Ind., Sept. 25.
1880, Meeting House, Wolf Creek, Montg. Co., Ohio, Dec. 8, 9 10.
1881, Meeting House, Painter Creek, Darke Co., Ohio, Aug. 24.

(After the Separation of 1881)

1882, Jesse Wogoman's, Wolf Creek, Montg. Co., Ohio.
1883, Bachelor's Run, Carroll Co., Ind.
1884, Abraham Garber's, Beaverdam, Md.
1885, John Filbrun's, Maple Grove, Miami Co., Ohio.
1886, David Skiles', Middle Fork, Clinton Co., Ind.
1887, Joseph Furrey's, Upper Twin, Preble Co., Ohio.
1888, Daniel Wagoner's, Cerro Gordo, Piatt Co., Ill.
1889, Josiah D. Baker's, Painter Creek, Darke Co., Ohio.
1890, Meeting House, N. Manchester, Wabash Co., Ind.
1891, David Cripe's, L. Stillwater, Montg Co., Ohio.
1892, Aaron B. Good's, Falling Springs, Franklin Co., Pa.
1893, Meeting House, Deer Creek, Carroll Co., Ind.
1894, Cedar Creek, Anderson Co., Kansas.
1895, J. E. Brubaker's, Peters Creek, Roanoke Co., Va.
1896, Rudolph Mohler's, Covington, Miami Co., Ohio.
1897, Daniel D. Skiles's, Middle Fork, Clinton Co., Ind.
1898, Benj. A. Frantz's, Donnels Creek, Clark Co., Ohio.
1899, Isaac P. Stitely's, Beaverdam, Frederick Co., Md.
1900, Meeting House, Deer Creek, Carroll Co., Ind.
1901, Daniel Wagoner's, Cerro Gordo, Piatt Co., Ill.
1902, Frank Petry's, Prices Creek, Preble Co., Ohio.
1903, Benj. Wise's, Yellow Creek, Elkhart Co., Ind.
1904, Henry H. Filbrun's, L. Stillwater, Montg. Co., Ohio.
1905, Willis Flora's, Bachelor Run, Carroll Co., Ind.
1906, William Landes's, Salem, Montg. Co., Ohio.
1907, Henry A. Good's, Falling Springs, Franklin Co., Pa.
1908, Henry Garber's, Wolf Creek, Montg. Co., Ohio.

1909, Levi Flory's, Willow Spring, Douglas Co., Kansas.
1910, Meeting House, N. Manchester, Wabash Co., Ind.
1911, Anthony Miller's, Sugar Creek, Allen Co., Ohio.
1912, Ezra Denlinger's, L. Stillwater, Montg. Co., Ohio.
1913, Elias B. Huffman's, Peters Creek, Roanoke Co., Va.
1914, Jos. S. Metzger's, Middle Fork, Clinton Co., Ind.
1915, Owen Montgomery's, L. Stillwater, Montg. Co., Ohio.
1916, Isaac Miller's, Shoal Creek, Newton Co., Mo.
1917, Meeting House, Deer Creek, Carroll Co., Ind.
1918, Myron J. Kinsley's, Covington, Miami Co., Ohio.
1919, Josiah D. Baker's, Painter Creek, Darke Co., Ohio.
1920, C. T. Kinzie's, Mexico, Miami Co., Ind.
1921, David W. Stitely's, Beaverdam, Frederick Co., Md.
1922, Jesse Brubaker's, Upper Twin, Preble Co., Ohio.
1923, Edward C. Miller's, North Fork, Carroll Co., Ind.
1924, James W. Wray's, Sand Creek, Pratt Co., Kansas.
1925, Ezra Flora's, Bachelor Run, Carroll Co., Ind.
1926, Aaron C. Denlinger's, L. Stillwater, Montg. Co., Ohio.
1927, Harry G. Benedict's, Falling Springs, Franklin Co., Pa.
1928, Benj. E. Fisher's, Wolf Creek, Montg. Co., Ohio.
1929, Meeting House, N. Manchester, Wabash Co., Ind.
1930, Jesse E. Blickenstaff's, Wood Colony, Stanislaus Co., Calif.
1931, Perry Garber's, Pipe Creek, Miami Co., Ind.
1932, John S. Baird's, Maple Grove, Miami Co., Ohio.
1933, Christian E. Jamison's, Peters Creek, Roanoke Co., Va.
1934, Alfred J. Brubaker's, Upper Twin, Preble Co., Ohio.
1935, Daniel D. Skiles's, Middle Fork, Clinton Co., Ind.
1936, Elmer L. Flory's, Willow Spring, Douglas Co., Kansas.
1937, Adam Blocher's, Deer Creek, Carroll Co., Ind.
1938, Pharo Baker's, Painter Creek, Darke Co., Ohio.
1939, David G. Benedict's, Falling Springs, Franklin Co., Pa.
1940, Samuel J. Garber's, Wolf Creek, Montg. Co., Ohio.
1941, Jesse E. Miller's, North Fork, Carroll Co., Ind.
1942, Ellen Wray's, Sand Creek, Pratt Co., Kansas.
1943, Della Lesh's, Bachelor Run, Carroll Co., Ind.

Index

Page
Acknowledgments 42-44
  Before Believers and Unbelievers 42
  Before Believers (The Church only) 43
  For Faults Between Members 43
  For Public Offences 44
Admitting Outsiders (Not Brethren) to Preach 44
Admitting Testimony from Outsiders 45-46
Adultery 46-57
Agents 59
Annual Meeting 1-42
  Manner of Holding 1-6
  Plan of 1866 6-10
  Queries 24-27
  Rules for Governing A. M. 27-29
  Decisions 29-34
Advancing Brethren in the Ministry 57-58
Aid—Soliciting For Institutions 58
Advertising Against Hunting 58
Advertisement to Local Churches 58
Alms, Collecting 59-63
Alms for Freedmen of South 63
Anointing the Sick 63-68
Anointing the Head 68-69
Anointing of Christ 69
Assignment of Property 69
Attest—Taking The 69-70
Auctioneering 70-71
Automobiles 73-78
Avoidance 78-87
Bailship for Criminals 87
Banks and Banking 113
Baptism 89-96
Bonds and Notes 113
Breaking Bread (See Communion) 157-160
Brethren in Germany 114
Buying Land Sold for Tax 114
Burial Cases and Caskets 114
Butchering 114
Camp Meetings 115
Carpets 115

Page
Carriages 115
Certificates of Membership 116-120
Choice and Installation of Officers 121-126
Church 127-130
Church (Isolated Churches) 130-131
Church Council 131-137
Christian Science and Magnetic Healing 137
Circulating Papers 138
Civil Government 138-138
Collecting Alms 139
Colleges 139-140
Colonization Society 141
Colored Members 141-142
Committees:
  Duties of 143
  Discontinued 144
  Expenses of 145
  Investigating 146
  Powers of 147
  Who Should Compose 151
  Qualifications of 151
  Calling for 152
  Selecting 154
Communion 157-164
Complaints 164-165
Conformity to the World 165-170
Congregational 170
Covering for the Head 170-171
Deacons—Office and Duty 171-177
Debts 182-184
Deeds—Changing Meaning of 184
Defending Our Order 184
Difference in Doctrine 185
Difficulties in Churches 186-198
Discipline of Children 198-199
District Meetings 200-202
Disturbance at A. M. 202
Divorce 203-205
Doctrines—Strange and Erroneous 205-218
Dress 219-220
Elections (Political) 221-224
Employment of Police 224

Page
Encyclopedia (Brethren's) 224
Excluded Members 225-229
Executorship 230
Fairs and Shows 231-232
Family Worship 232
Far Western Brethren 232-233
Farmers' Club 239
Fashionable Garments 234-238
Fasting 239
Feasting 240
Feetwashing 240-244
Forfeit Money 244
Fornication 244-247
Form of Affirmation 244
Full Report of A. M. 248-249
Funerals 249-251
Grange Society 251
Hunting—Advertising Against 251
Hymn Books 252-258
Implements of War 258
Infares 259
Installations 260-264
Insurance 264-267
Interest 267-269
Jewelry 270
Juries 270-271
Kiss—The Holy 271-273
Know Nothing Party 273
Labor Unions 274
Languages—English, German 274
Law—The Civil 275-278
Law—Release of Convicts 278
Law—Against Debtors 278-282
Laying Out Towns 282
Lecturing On Temperance 282
Letters of Greeting 282
Legacies:
  Garber 283
  Karn 283-285
Lightning Rods 285
Likenesses 286
Liquors, Intoxicating 287-294

Page

- Lord's Supper 294-299
- Lotteries 299-301
- Majority Rule 303
- Marriage 304-310
- Meeting Houses 310
- Meetings:
  - Protracted 311
  - Social 312
  - Public Worship 313-318
  - Disorderly 318
- Ministers:
  - Fallen 319
  - Making Appointments 320
  - Making Mistakes 320
  - Moving 321
  - Serving on Arbitrations 322
  - Taking Pay 322
- Ministry (To be called by Church) 322-329
- Mission (Danish) 329
- Missionary 330-339
  - Plan for Isolated Churches 339-341
- Moderators and Clerks 341
- Musical Instruments 342-344
- Mustaches 344
- Mustering (Military) 345-346
- Name of Our Fraternity 347
- Nearest Friends in Council 347
- Nonconformity to the World 348-352
- Nonresistance 348-355
- Oaths, Swearing of 355
- Offenses 356-359
- Office Holding—Worldly or Civil 359-362
- Official Council 4 362
- Officials, Seating of 363-364
- Officials, Reinstating 364-365
- Officials, Ordination of 365
- Orphans' Home 366
- Patent Rights 366
- Peace 367
- Pensions for Soldiers 367
- Physician—Not to Advertise as Member of Church 368
- Politics 368

Page

Prayer 369
Prayer Meetings 370-371
Preaching 371-373
Publications—Periodical 373-382
Public Works—Construction of 382
Pulpit 383-384
Radio 384
Railroad Privileges and Stocks 387-388
Rebaptism 388-391
Receiving Fallen Members 391-394
Receiving from "Conservative" & "Progressive" Bodies 394-395
Receiving Sick Persons without Baptism 395
Resolutions 396
Refreshment Stands 397
Respect to Aged 398
Restoration Doctrine 398-399
Returning Thanks 399
Revision of Minutes 399
Reward On Stolen Goods 399
Secret Societies 400-404
Selling Books at A. M. 404
Slavery 404-408
Spiritual Rappings 400
Standing Committees 408-413
Schools:
    Sabbath or Sunday 415-417
    Singing 417
    Lebating, Lyceums 418
    High Schools, Colleges 418-420
    Exhibitions 420
    Sunday 413-415
Suspending Members 421
Suspending Ministers 421
Tavern Keeping 421
Taxation 421-422
Teaching by Lay Brethren 422-423
Teaching by Sisters 424
Telephones 424-425
Temperance 425-426
Tents 426-429
Testimony of Members 429
Testimony of Outsiders 429-431

Page
Thanksgiving 431
Territory—Buying Right to Sell in 431
Tobacco 431-433
Traditions 434
Trafficking or Trading 435
Vindicator, The 435
Visiting Applicants for Baptism 436
Visiting Members Yearly 436-438
Visiting Churches 438
Voice of Church—Taking Private 439
Warfare 438-439
Wine at Communion 440
Wives of Ministers and Deacons 441

PART II

Petitions, Propositions and Statements to Annual Meeting:

Petition of 1869 442-443
Petition of 1880 443
Answer and Substitute 447-450
Pomona, Kansas, Petition, 1913 450-462
Answer to Pomona Petition 451
Modesto, Calif. Petition, 1915 452
Petition for New Minute Book 452
Petition to Y. M..... 1918 452
Hymn Book Committee 453
Tent Committee 453
Vindicator Committee 453
Adjustment of Certain Irregularities 454
Standing Committee's Conclusion 455
Petition of the "Old Brethren" Body 457
Debt on Lakeland, Fla. M. H. 457
Resignation of Elder John F. Flora 459
Church in Ontario, Canada Organized 459
Appointment on Vindicator Committee 459
A Proposition of Standing Committee 460
to Wood Colony Church, Calif. 460
Various Petitions to A. M. of 1938 461
Petition to A. M. of 1939 461
Petition of Standing Committee to A. M. 1939 462
Index for Book of Minutes 462

Page

PART III

Reports to Annual Meeting:

On Subject of Slavery 463
Of Committee to Philadelphia Church 464
Concerning S. Z. Sharp and H. R. Holsinger 466
Of Committee to California ....
On the Subject of Feetwashing, 1877 472
Of Committee to Upper Dublin Church, Pa. 473
On Plan for Holding A. M., 1879 ;.......... 474
On Evangelization 475-476
In Relation to Certain Petitions Circulated in 1879-1880....476-7
Of Committee to Eastern Maryland 477
In Regard to Certain Article in "Progressive Christian" and "Vindicator" 478
In Regard to Periodicals 481
First Report of Hymn Book Committee, 1883 483
Report of Revision Committee 484
Report of Minute Book Committee 486
Commendatory from Standing Committee 488
Report on German Hymn Book 489
Tent Committee Reports 489-512
Vindicator Committee Reports 492-496
Report of 1917 Committee to Ohio Churches 493
Report of 1921 Committee to Ohio Churches 493
Report of Hymn Book Committee, 1927 496
Report of Committee for "Old Brethren" Body 498
Report of Plan for Sending ministers to Isolated Churches.... 502
Report of Committees to Local Churches 504
Report of Committee on Min. Book Index 508
Report of Minute Book Committee 509-513
Report of C. O. Committee 511-513
Annual Meeting Materials to Be Held Jointly by Indiana and Ohio A. M. Districts 511

PART IV

Standing Committees 514-528

PART V

Committees to Churches 529-544

PART VI

Time and Place of Annual Meetings 545-548

APPENDIX---PAPERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

The Reconsidered Minutes .... 1—12

The Brethren's Reasons

Introductory Statement and Explanation........ 13—14

Petition of 1869........ 14—17

Supplement to Petition........ 16—21

Compromise by A. M........ 21—22

Miami Valley Petition of 1880........ 26—30

Substitute to Petition of 1880........ 31—33

Minutes of The Miami Valley Council and the Petition....32—36

Resolution Against Miami Valley Petition
Adopted by The A. M. of 1881........ 36—40

Resolutions of August 24, 1881........ 42—45

The Effect 46

Law Suits

In Miami County, Ohio........ 53

In Cedar County, Iowa........ 54

In Franklin County, Pa........ 55

In Darke County, Ohio........ 55

An Extract From Brethren's Encyclopedia of 1867........ 61

Introductory Address 62

Reflections 64

PART VII.

APPENDIX

THE RECONSIDERED MINUTES

In Sections, as Read and Accepted by the Yearly Meetings of 1883 and 1884

[NOTE.—THE PUBLISHERS place these in a separate chapter for the benefit of the reader, that he may see the work of the Committee on Revision all at a glance, they having been presented before the Yearly Meeting at two separate yearly sessions, thus freeing them from other matter connected with these meetings.]

First Session—1883

SEC. 1. HIGH SCHOOLS, ETC. All that encourage the "high things"—high schools, college, or Brethren's schools—as contrary to sound doctrine. See Minutes of 1853, Article 28; 1857, Article 19. See Rom. xii. 16. Those otherwise decided, disapproved.

SEC. 2. SUNDAY-SCHOOLS. These, having no explicit scriptural or apostolic authority for precedence, rejected. But as it stands upon the resolutions, "More of human origin than the command of Christ," a custom of this world, HAVE NONE. [See resolutions.]

SEC. 3. FEET-WASHING. Not in any other way than in the double mode. Minutes of 1872, Article 17, approved. All other changes on Minutes otherwise strictly cut off. [See resolutions.]

SEC. 4. SUPPER, THE LORD'S. Pertaining to the time and order in the house of the Lord to be as it was understood in the great meeting of 1822, Article 3; 1844, Article 2; 1849, Article 19.

SEC. 5. MISSIONARY. All on the misionary queries refused, but we indorse the Resolutions, and petition upon gospel order. We advise ministers to be actively engaged in meeting the many calls for having the gospel preached, and advise the members also to encourage them to go; and that they show, thereby, a willingness to extend a helping hand in bearing the expenses of the ministry, to go and assist those who ask for the help in the church work. **No treasury in the hands of a board,** leaving the church have the exclusive oversight, to meet **every** emergency, alluring none to preach for the sake of money.

SEC. 6. PERIODICALS. We refuse all minutes on this subject. Endorse the decision of Annual Meeting of 1882, Article 3.

SEC. 7. UNLAWFUL INTEREST. All minutes retained. We accept the Resolutions. The poor must be cared for by alms giving. No unlawful interest taken from any one. See minutes of 1837, Article 9, 1845, Article 4.

SEC. 8. MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS. The Resolutions are very decidedly opposed to organs, pianos, melodeons, etc.—a worldly custom. Minutes are indefinite and confusing, lame in judgment touching offenses. They do not become a meek and lowly follower of Jesus Christ, fail to cultivate self-denial and sobriety, with shamefacedness, according to the simplicity of the gospel and order of the Brethren; they please the carnal mind, contrary to our promise of baptism. [See James v. 13; Eph. v. 19.] Reject all minutes and endorse Resolutions.

SEC. 9. INSURANCE. All former minutes repudiated. Endorse minutes of 1882, Article 10. No encouragement to take part in fire or life insurance, contrary to our faith in the word of God, of the old fathers, who admonished us not to follow the ways of this world. [See I. John ii. 15.]

SEC. 10. PULPIT, OR STANDS. Going up on stands to preach in meeting houses of other persuasions. We retain the minutes of 1851, Article 23, it being one which expresses the order of our fathers, and is best suited to be governed by under such trying occasions. This committee adopted with this amendment, substituting the word "reasonably" before the word "avoid," so as to make it read thus, "When they can reasonably avoid it." All others pertaining to our meeting houses void. This meeting confirmed the substituting of the amendment offered.

SEC. 11. ADULTERY, FORNICATION. All decisions on these subjects are in harmony with the gospel as understood by the old brethren. Hence all retained so far as they embrace the same facts in similar cases.

SEC. 12. TOBACCO, culture and using. All the minutes good as could be expected. Our fathers gave us good advice. These minutes do not foster or encourage the desire of either. All retained. The committee recommended to this meeting to advise all our dear members to quit raising or using after the manner of the world.

SEC. 13. WINE AT COMMUNION. We retain all decisions of former years as the fathers understood it. Simply Wine. See minutes of 1858, Article 36. All others since disapproved.

SEC. 14. FORMS, ORDINATIONS, ANOINTING THE SICK. We endorse them as they stand upon the book. Deacons, 1835, Article 15. Ministers, 1874, Article 9; Elders, 1877, Article 31; Anointing, 1860, Article 6.

SEC. 15. Full report of speeches of Annual Meeting. We endorse the decisions of 1870, Article 9; repudiate all others.

SEC. 16. DISTRICT MEETINGS AND ANNUAL MEETINGS. Repudiate all decisions giving sanction for District Meetings [See Resolutions] for holding Annual Meetings. We retain the decision of 1848, Article 29, with the amendment of Annual Meeting of 1882, Article 2. All others void. A reprint of said minutes upon those minutes—1882.

SEC. 17. BAPTIZING in house or pool, not the ancient order. All decisions void.

SEC. 18. PICTURES, TYPES OF ALL KINDS OF HUMAN FACES TAKEN BY ARTISTS. We retain all as good and advisory up till 1872, Article 10. But a slip from the faith and the order there occurs, "To put them out of sight," making provision to secrete them, which is an abuse of non-conformity, that is, to have them taken. We reject it and all others.

SEC. 19. CARPETS IN OUR HOUSES. The minutes of 1878, Art. 10. We adopt: ask it to be reprinted on these minutes.

SEC. 20. CERTIFICATES OF MEMBERSHIP. The former decisions upon this subject we retain, and from this forward we advise to supply the word "Old" in connection with the title "German Baptists." This feature not to be omitted in certificates.

Second Session—1884

SEC. 21. PRAYER MEETINGS. We adopt the advice given 1851, Article 15, 16. (Accepted.)

SEC. 22. MEMBERS COMMUNING WHEN OUT OF ORDER. We adopt Article 21, 1851. (Accepted.)

SEC. 23. HOW SHOULD THE BRETHREN PROCEED AFTER PREACHING TO GET PERSONS TO UNITE WITH THE CHURCH? We refer to Article 39, 1858.

SEC. 24. SOCIAL MEETINGS. What is termed social meetings, according to the general acceptance of the term, have none; but recommend that all our meetings for solemn worship be held as set forth in **Miami Valley Petition** of 1880, and also resolutions of August 24, 1881. (Accepted.)

SEC. 25. BELLS UPON OUR MEETING-HOUSES. We adopt the minutes of 1859, Article 25, also 1865, Article 54, whose advice is, "HAVE NONE."

SEC. 26. SCHOOL EXHIBITIONS. The subject of members or their children attending and taking part in school exhibitions, lyceums, and debates, we find that there is more liberty granted than what, in our humble judgment, is in harmony with the duties enjoined upon parents "bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." So we would recommend to advise parents not to go, and also instruct their children not to attend and take part in such proceedings and like kinds of gatherings of the world. (Accepted.)

SEC. 27. INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES. How to proceed. See Article 2, 1865. (Accepted.)

SEC. 28. INVESTING IN GOVERNMENT BONDS. See Article 16, 1864, and Article 39, 1865. In the above it is allowed, but we recommend to advise that members would do well not to invest. (Accepted.)

SEC. 29. RAISING FUNDS BY TAXATION. See Article 2, 1868. (Accepted.)

SEC. 30. CARING FOR THE POOR ORPHAN CHILDREN. See Article 3, 1812, and Article 8, 1870. (Accepted.)

SEC. 31. ON MEMBERS ENTERING INTO MATRIMONY. In regard to Article 23, 1871, we recommend to advise, they should marry in the church. (Accepted.)

SEC. 32. ON BRINGING A MATTER BEFORE THE CHURCH relative to the officials being united. We adopt Article 26, 1877. (Accepted.)

SEC. 33. PAYING OF EXPENSES when committees are called to settle difficulties. We adopt Article 13, 1858. (Accepted.)

SEC. 34. DECIDING QUESTIONS at Yearly Meetings. Minutes of 1880, Article 1, says: "Questions shall be decided by a large majority vote." But we refer for the deciding of questions to Article 29, 1848, thus holding to the unanimity principle as held by our forefathers. (Accepted.)

SEC. 35. RECEIVING MEMBERS into the church from their first application. We adopt Article 3, 1848. (Accepted.)

SEC. 36. HOW SHALL MEMBERS APPROACH THE YEARLY MEETINGS for committees to investigate difficulties? We adopt the plan set forth in the minutes of 1882, passed at the Yearly Meeting held at Wolf Creek Church, Montgomery County, Ohio, Article 2. It being complied with, then (they) bring a copy of the proceedings of their investigations properly signed, and present said copy to the Standing Committee. (Accepted.)

SEC. 37. ORDAINING ELDERS. We adopt the decision of Article 41, 1865, and disapprove of Article 28, 1856, and ask for a reprint on these minutes as the form found in minutes of 1877, Article 31.

NOTE—Accepted by this meeting, with an amendment of the last line in second paragraph, where it reads, "as defined by the brethren in Annual Meeting assembled," to read thus: "As defined and handed down by our faithful forefathers of the church;" and also in the third paragraph, third line, omit the clause "Without any mental reservation."—CLERK. THE ORDINATION IS AS FOLLOWS:

THE FORM OF ORDINATION

(Being the form adopted by the Annual Meeting of 1877, Article 31, as amended by the revision committee and adopted by the Annual Meeting of 1884.)

DEAR BROTHER A. B.:—The church having called you to the ministry of the word, and on trial has found you faithful in your calling, she now proposes to advance you to the full ministry by ordaining you an elder, or bishop, by the laying on of hands by the Presbytery. In ordaining you as an elder, the church gives you all the right and authority belonging to the ministry, such as presiding in council meetings in which official members are tried, at home or abroad, if you are called to do so, in churches or Annual Meetings; to give the charge to deacons or ministers, and to install them into their respective offices. In short, the church now invests you with all the rights and authority belonging to the eldership, you being equal to all the elders; this phrase, nevertheless, in the apostolic injunction, "Ye younger submit yourselves to the elder," still applies to you, and should you manifest an arbitrary, self willed, and domineering spirit, the church will hold you subject to her councils, and suspend you, and take from you all the authority she now gives you, and again reduce you to the laity, or even expel you from membership, if necessary.

It will be your duty faithfully to preach the word, and to care for the wants of all the membership, being yourself an example to the church in all holiness and purity of heart, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. It will be your duty in all affairs of the church to counsel with your official brethren and with the church, taking the oversight not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind, and in no way to lord it over God's heritage. The church will not allow you to depart from the order of the general brotherhood in faith and practice of the Scriptures as defined by the faithful brethren, and our forefathers in the church.

Now, dear Brother A. B., do you willingly accept the position into which the church now proposes to put you? And do you, in good faith, accept and adopt all the order and practice of the general brotherhood in all her peculiarities, plainness of dress, and non-conformity to the world? And do you promise to unite your labors with all your faithful brethren everywhere, to observe and enforce all the faith and practice of the general brotherhood? The elders will now lay hands on the brother, and pray, and the church will then receive him in the usual order, by the right hand of fellowship and kiss of love. And it will be the duty of the church to honor and respect the brother in the office of bishop, according to the apostolic instruction, and to aid him in observing all the faith and order of the general brotherhood.

Also we ask for a **reprint** of the Form of Installing ministers. See Article 8, 1874. (Accepted.)

Installation of Ministers

REPRINT. ART. 8. Would it not be proper for the Annual Meeting to adopt a form, to be used by the elders in installing a brother into the first and second degrees of the ministry, so that all ministers would be installed in office by a uniform charge, as is done in regard to installing deacons? Article 8, in minutes of 1874 Answer: The elder, installing a brother into the first degree of the ministry, should give the following charge:

The duties of the brother elected, while in the first degree of the ministry, are not very onerous. The church authorizes him to exhort and to preach as an assistant to the elder and older ministers, as they may give him liberty to do. It is his duty, however, faithfully to attend the meetings of the church, and when liberty is given, to exhort or preach, and do it humbly, and willingly, and faithfully, as the Lord will afford him grace to do. But should it happen that none of the older ministering brethren should come to the regular appointment, then it will be his duty, and he is hereby authorized, to conduct the meeting according to the usual order of the brethren to the best of his ability, and to announce the regular appointments; but he has no authority to make or announce any appointments on his own private account. In case, however, he is called to preach on a funeral occasion, he is at liberty and is hereby authorized to go and conduct the services according to the usual order of the brethren. And it is thought good that the elder and older ministering brethren should be liberal in giving him the liberty to preach, and not always confine him to the closing services, or he may not soon learn how to be a workman approved of God, that needs not be ashamed, **"rightfully dividing the word of truth."**

The brother's name should now be announced, and he should be called to come forward and asked, before all, to promise to conform to the general order of the brotherhood, in dress and all matters of non-conformity to the world, whether he accepts the position into which the church purposes to place him, and whether he will so submit himself; and if he answers in the affirmative, the brethren will receive him with the right hand of fellowship and the kiss of charity, and the sisters with the right hand of fellowship only.

And to advance a brother into the second degree of the ministry, the elder giving the charge may say:

Dear Brother [calling his name], the church having called you into the first degree of the ministry, and on trial has confidence in your fidelity and integrity, now proposes to advance you into the second degree, and thereby your labors will be increased and your duties will become more onerous, and will require a greater sacrifice on your part. The church now authorizes you to appoint meetings for preaching, according to the general order of the brethren; to administer the ordinance of baptism, and, in the absence of an elder, to take counsel of the church on the admission of an applicant for baptism; to serve the communion in the absence of an elder, or at his request, if present; to solemnize the right of marriage according to the laws of the state and the usages of the church. In brief, to perform all the duties of an ordained elder, excepting you have no authority to install officers in the church, neither by giving a charge (as I am now doing), nor by laying on hands in ordaining a brother into the full degree of the ministry. You have also no authority to preside in the council-meetings of the church in which the official members of the church are to be dealt with. You have no authority to go into the acknowledged territory of any organized church to make appointments for preaching, unless called by the elder or council of said church. It is an assumption of authority for an ordained elder to do so; but let it be understood that while the church now invests you with these rights and privileges, she still holds you to the apostolic injunction, "Ye younger, submit yourselves to the elder; yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble" (I. Peter v. 5), and will hold you amenable to her councils; and if you manifest an arbitrary self-will and domineering spirit, the same authority which now gives you these privileges will, if need requires it, suspend you and take from you all the authority she now gives you.

The brother should rise on his feet and be asked to promise to conform to the general order of the brotherhood in dress and all matters of non-conformity to the world, and whether he accepts this position, and whether he will submit himself; and if he answers in the affirmative, the church should again receive him, as at first, with hand and kiss.

Installation of Visiting Brethren

Also ask for a reprint of installing Visiting brethren. See Article 15, 1835. Accepted.)

ART. 15. What is the duty of a visiting brother? First, as visiting brethren and overseers of the poor of the church, they have to assist and attend to the yearly general visit from house to house; and it is necessary and their duty, when the church is divided into different Visit Districts, to take the lead in the visit as well as that of the ministers, and in case the ministers could not assist on account of sickness, it is the duty of the deacons to carry out the visit with the other brethren, and to bring before the minister and the church what they have found. Further, when anything of importance is to be investigated in the church, the ministers have the right to request them (the deacons) to accompany them, or if the case is not of special importance, to send them (the deacons) to investigate the matter and bring it before the ministry. Further, it is their duty, inasmuch as they have been elected overseers of the poor, to visit the sick, especially if they are poor, who may be in distress by reason of sickness or other causes, to examine their case, and to report to the ministry, and, if necessary, the ministers to hold a council with the church what is further to be done. When money or grain is contributed to the church, it is their duty to keep a regular book account of what they receive and what they lay out for the poor or otherwise for the church, so they are able at times to render an account with and to the church. Upon the whole, all that may occur in the church, and is to be investigated, is committed to their care, and if they hear of anything, to bring it before the ministers, to counsel whether it is to be examined, and to see it done if found necessary. Further, it is their calling to assist the ministers (at meetings) by reading the Scriptures, by using freedom in prayer, and to bear testimony to what was spoken; and if it should happen that no minister (of the word) could come to meeting, it is their duty to lead the worship by singing, prayer, and reading the Scriptures, and if they feel so, to exhort to the edification of the congregation; yet it was the counsel of the old brethren that it is not their calling to rise on their feet in order to exhort; and thus to conclude the meeting in the usual order, and to make the ordinary appointments for meeting. again: when a minister is called to hold meetings in another district, and he requests the visiting brethren to give him company and assistance, it is their duty to assist, and one or the other to go with him. Further: it is their duty to serve at the tables,, when a love-feast is held, to make the necessary preparations, to call as many other brethren as they need to assist, and at the time of the love-feast to see to it that the sisters can get all things ready at the proper time, and themselves setting the tables, and so in all things see to it that everything is done decently and in order.

SEC. 38. VISITING BRETHREN NOT IN THEIR CALLING TO RISE UPON THEIR FEET IN ORDER TO EXHORT. We adopt as a general rule. See Article 15, 1835. (Accepted,)

SEC. 39. ON POLITICAL VOTING. We adopt decision Article 33, 1849. Said Article reads as follows: "Is it safe and proper for the humble followers of Jesus to go to the elections (worldly) and take an active part in the political affairs of the country? Considered, as it was always the advice of the old brethren, and as the anointing [see I. John ii. 27] will teach every sincere follower of Jesus that it would be safest in regard to political elections to remain as neutral as possible, and rather than go to the election, to commit the matter in prayer to Him who setteth up and removeth rulers." Accepted.)

SEC. 40. LIGHTNING-RODS. In considering the different minutes on the above subject, we would recommend to advise members **not to have them,** but to put all their **trust in God.** (Accepted.)

SEC. 41. ASKING AID. We adopt the decision of 1852, Article 18.

SEC. 42. NON-CONFORMITY. We find that there are minutes that allow of different ways of wearing the hair, etc. For the sake of unanimity of practice we adopt the counsel given in Article 27, 1866, which is as follows: "Inasmuch as pride and inclination to follow the fashions of the world are still increasing among us, in wearing fine apparel, frock and sack coats, dusters, shawls, etc., with the hair parted off to one-side, or shingled and roached, moustaches, etc. The sisters also wearing fine apparel, going without caps, wearing hoops, hats, veils, overcoats, jewelry, etc., and as an admonition in some cases, has not affected anything, can not this Yearly Meeting propose some plan by which this growing evil may be arrested? Answer: We think members of the church, conforming to the fashions of the world, as above stated, should be admonished again and again; and if they will not hear the church, the Savior has given directions in Matthew xviii. how to deal with them." (Accepted.)

SEC. 43. YEARLY VISITS. We find the form given (see Article 2, 1867), is not in full harmony with the usages of our faithful brethren. We would recommend the words, **"Conform to the order of the church,"** which our forefathers of the church did commit unto us as the best, namely:

Question 1st. "Are you, dear brother (or sister, as the case may be), of the same mind as when you were received into the church by your baptism?" Q. 2d. "Are you still willing to receive and give counsel according to the gospel order?" Q. 3d. "Are you, as far as you know, in peace and union with the church?" 4th. (Remarks, if any, by the interrogated member or members, etc.) There is now liberty, dear brother (or sister, as the case may be), given to you should you see or have any knowledge of anything among your dear members which would be out of order, and contrary to sound doctrine (if let go on so), now is your time to make it known."

Otherwise, say nothing; nor should anything be accepted by the visiting brethren which is or would be of a personal nature, until Matthew xviii. has been fully carried out and complied with. And further, that the visiting brethren do not neglect their duty in admonishing the members and their children to their duties, to attend the meetings, to read the Scriptures, etc.—more especially when requested to do so. Their devotions should be attended with singing and prayer. (Accepted.)

Sec. 44. In reconsidering the minutes of 1880, Article 23, we find the answer to the Miami Valley Petition not to be in harmony with the former usages of the church. Hence, we do not accept said answer nor the "Substitute" Petition.* Also, in 1881, Article 22, we find a decision that it (the above substitute and answer) remain UNCHANGED. For man to make such decisions is **unscriptural.** Therefore for the above reasons we are dissatisfied with the answer given, inasmuch as the counsels of our Yearly Meetings only give advice instead of making **unalterable laws.** The foregoing are among the reasons why the Miami Valley Petition and Resolutions were adopted. (Accepted.)

FOOT NOTE:

*PUBLISHERS' NOTE.—The decision alluded to reads as follows: "ARTICLE 23, 1880, **Resolved, That the** decisions in regard to what is called the Miami Valley elders' petition is as near right as any that can be reached upon the question embodied in said petition; and the prosperity of the brotherhood demands that said decisions of Annual Conference of 1880 **remain unchanged.** Answer: We decide that it remain unchanged."

These are the concluding remarks of the committee appointed by the Yearly Meeting of 1882, held at Wolf Creek, Montgemory County, Ohio, May 29th, and continued by the Yearly Meeting of 1883, May 15th and 17th:

We, the committee appointed by the Yearly Meeting to revise the minutes and strike out all the dicisions which have given encouragement to the many changes and deviations from the old established order and practice of the church, have in weakness, but in the fear of God, accomplished our work to the best of our ability, at the time and place above stated. Now, be it particularly noticed that we have done our work in a plain and simple way, so as to hold all the minutes of said book in full faith and practice, whose decisions are in perfect harmony with the ancient established order of the old Brethren's church, and we hope that our **method** of procedure will have the effect to hold in rememberance and for future reference the councils of our old departed brethren contained in the said book of minutes.

Again, the minutes of 1883 being read, **this** your committee agreed that it might be necessary to reconsider the words "revise" and "strike out" (as not the words best suited to our purpose), which has also been done, and the word "reconsider" adopted as being more suitable to express the meaning intended.

So we now send forth the result of our labors to this Yearly Meeting for amendment or adoption, praying that our ardent and nightly labors may be to the honor and glory of God, our heavenly Father, and to the good comfort of God's laboring Zion.

Signed by the committee: Elder G. V. Siler, of Ohio; Elder John Hershey, of Missouri; Elders Joseph I. Cover, Aaron Frantz, H. D. Davy, Daniel Brower, and Samuel Murray, of Ohio.

THE BRETHREN'S REASONS

For Producing and Adopting the Resolutions of August 24th

Consisting of a Collection of Petitions Made to the Annual Meeting From Year to Year, But Without Grant and the Accomplishment of the Much Desired Ends Prayed For

GREETINGS

To all the dear brethren and sisters in Christ, GREETING:

May the blessings of the Lord, with the communion of the Holy Spirit, rest and abide with His faithful Israel and all the true, devoted seekers after truth, which alone is able to save us and to make us conquerors through Him that loved us, gave Himself for us, and redeemed us from iniquity.

Fraternally, SAMUEL MURRAY, GEORGE V. SILER, SAMUEL KINSEY.

January, 1883.

THE OBJECT

The object and purpose of this pamphlet is to show how frequently the brethren did petition the Annual Meeting to put away the new and fast movements in the church, and to explain and set forth the REASONS and GROUNDS for producing and adopting the Resolutions of August 24, 1881; and to show the opposition that arose, the trying times that many at first had to pass through, and to leave upon record, for the benefit of our children and the rising generation, the work and earnest labors of the old faithful brethren, to maintain the order and hold to the "old landmarks" of the German Baptist, or Dunkard Church, "which our fathers have set," and so hand it down to them "as we learned it."

The Brethren's Reasons, Petitions, Etc.

In these last days and "perilous times, when some of the solemn predictions of the word of the Lord are being fulfilled, when iniquity abounds on every hand, and when evil men and seducers are waxing worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived;" when the right ways of the Lord are being more and more perverted, and when even the faith, the worship, and the practice of our own dear brotherhood has been altered and changed in many places by those who are "ever learning but never able to come to the knowledge of the truth," and by the sanction of the higher council, that many dear members, feeling they could no longer stand in fellowship with such grave departures from the faith, and with a clear and uncontaminated conscience appear before the Judge, did, by the Resolutions of August 24th, so resolve to sever their fellowship from such innovations and departures, lest they be partakers thereof, and endeavor, by the divine aid, to adhere more firmly to the once accepted and recognized faith and practice of the church, and thus regain and re-instate what in many parts of the brotherhood had been put away and lost sight of and the movement and resolutions of the brethren having been much misrepresented, and very erroneous impressions having been made, together with reports of various sorts, causing much inquiry as to the real facts in the case, with the purpose and object of the work, it occurred to the minds of many members of the Old Order part of the Brethren; or German Baptist Church, that it would be good to have printed, in pamphlet form, some of the petitions sent to the Annual Meeting from time to time, praying that body to adopt measures by which to do away with some things which were introduced into the church, which caused trouble and threatened division. So, on the 28th day of November, 1882, after the forenoon services at a love-feast, held in the Wolf Creek Church, Montgomery County, Ohio, a number of elders and ministers convened at the house of Bro. John Kimmel, and there unanimously agreed that this be done, and where the brethren, whose names have already herein appeared, were appointed to collect and cause to be printed such petitions and other matter that will set forth the efforts that were made, and also show how such efforts were respected and treated, showing the **reasons** for the Brethren's movements in adopting the Resolutions.

We therefore, first, bring forward a petition sent to Annual Meeting in 1869, with its explanation and supplement, as follows:

EXPLANATION TO THE FOLLOWING PETITION

In order to correct reports and for the information of the brethren—those who may desire a copy of this petition—we deem it proper to make the fololwing statement, or explanation:

After much serious reflection upon the present condition of the church, it came into the hearts of some of our oldest fathers in the church, that the time had fully arrived that a consultation upon this subject was highly necessary, and the 14th day of November, 1868, was selected to consider the matter. In the meanwhile, in order to know the minds of more brethren, a number of them met on the 13th of October previous, where about twenty brethren—mostly elders—expressed themselves as being much grieved at the present digression of the church, in many localities, from her ancient order and practice; and the sentiment generally seemed to be that something must be done, and accordingly it was agreed that our next Annual Meeting should, **in the first place,** be petitioned to fall back upon her ancient order in doing business, etc., and that in case it would refuse to do so, they were fearful that many churches would not be represented at the next Annual Meeting. And the 13th instead of the 14th day of November was named for further consultation, where the following petition was produced and signed by many brethren. And now, inasmuch as many have requested a copy, and as copying so many by hand proved rather laborious, we have, by order of the brethen, printed a limited supply, which we will cheerfully forward to **brethren only,** for which we make no charge, yet will accept any trifle that brethren may choose to give us, to cover cost of printing and postage. Address,

SAMUEL KINSEY, Box 44, Dayton, Ohio.

PETITION

We, the undersigned, elders, teachers, and visiting brethren from various districts of the church in the State of Ohio, being assembled in the fear of the Lord and prayer, upon the 13th day of November, 1868, for consultation upon matters with regard to the present condition of the church, do unanimously and **most earnestly** petition our next Annual Conference, to be held in the State of Virginia, in the spring of 1869, to change, at least in the following particulars, its present manner of conducting business, etc., etc., so that in the future our Annual Conference Meetings be conducted more in **simplicity** and after the manner of our first brethren.

1. From the elders present at the place of Annual Meeting let there be six or eight of the old experienced and established brethren selected, and these need not be selected like our representatives in Congress—a certain number from each state, as each state from its peculiar circumstances, condition, etc., has

its peculiar laws adapted to its own wants, but not so with regard to the church. Her rules and understandings must be the same throughout **all** the states, and hence let those brethren be selected from either or all of the states as prudence and the Holy Spirit may suggest; and let not their names appear on the minutes as "Standing Committee." After having withdrawn, let those brethren receive the queries, etc., from the different districts represented, and let them present the same in order before the meeting for consideration. A minute of the proceedings of the meeting to be kept by some brother present. Let those old selected brethren see that there be order, if necessity require, but let no brother be selected as (human) moderator; rather submit that office to the dictations of the Holy Spirit. Let all the business, we entreat, be transacted in great simplicity, and thus **do away** with those worldly-wise regulations, such as selecting a certain portion of the Standing Committee from each state, appointing a moderator, etc., and to have their names affixed upon the minutes.

These points we look upon as tending to elevation, through which also the business and power is gradually concentrating too much into the hands of a few. Let us all be members one of another, and above all, we say, **close the door** against that which has a tendency to elevate and exalt the mind, lest Paul would say of us, "But I fear lest as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtility, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." (II. Corinthians.)

We think it advisable that the minutes of conference be again read to all at the close of the meeting, and then let them be witnessed by several of the old elders, but avoid especially designating those who had been selected to receive the reports of the churches.

2. We petition conference to desist from sending committees to the various churches where difficulties exist. We advise that all churches who need assistance call upon the elders, etc., in adjoining districts to come to their help, for it is probable that in most cases these have a better knowledge of the case than those brethren sent to them from a distance. And let all cases where any of the ordinances or doctrinal points are involved be reported to conference, and let conference, after having considered the case, write accordingly to the church where the difficulty exists. Let two brethren be chosen to carry and deliver the epistle to said church. This will be according to the

practice of the apostles' days, for proof of which see the fifteenth chapter of Acts.

3. We further petition this meeting to counsel and advise Brethren Quinter, and Kurtz, and H. R. Holsinger, to publish nothing in their periodicals that disputes the practice of the precepts and ordinances of the gospel as handed down to us from Christ and the apostles, through and by the forefathers of the church; and let Brothers Nead, Kinsey, and all the brethren who write, be cautioned upon this head.

In conclusion we say, that if this Conference Meeting shall hear and grant this petition, well; but in case it shall refuse to do so, it is very probable that many churches will not be represented at our next Annual Conference, and hence the result will be a reorganization of our Conference Meetings by said churches in accordance with this petition.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE FOREGOING PETITION

To the Beloved Brethren and Sisters Wherever
This May Be Read, Greeting:

On Easter Monday, the 29th day of March, 1869, a number of the brethren and sisters of the "Miami Valley" churches in Ohio, assembled in the "Bear Creek" Meeting-house for the purpose of adopting measures consistent with the gospel, whereby the church may be cleansed, if possible, from the doctrines and principles of the popular religion of the day, and to prevent the further introduction of said doctrines and principles into our fraternity.

Brethren, it is clearly seen that our church has varied much from her ancient principles of humility and self-denial. You who have been members of the church for many years, and have had experience, and can remember how our fathers and forefathers viewed and conducted matters in the church, can testify to the above truth; and for your sake it would be needless to particularize, but for the sake of those of our dear brethren who have not had the age and experience, and have perhaps never had the opportunity of becoming thoroughly acquainted with the **fundamental principles** of our church, **we name a few** items:

1. **"Protracted Meetings."** We are much in favor of an active and industrious ministry, and that, like our Savior, the apostles, and our old brethren before us, we "preach the word" wherever opportunities present themselves, and necessity seems to require; but we seriously object to the way in which those

meetings are so frequently conducted. We have a reference here to the working upon the passions of the people, and without giving them sufficient time to reflect and consider the cost, hurry them into the church, and that without demanding of them a full compliance to the doctrine of self-denial, etc., also, the "boasting" or loud spirit that so often **will** manifest itself upon such occasions, together with their tendency in general. That there is a "deceiving spirit" attending many of those meetings can easily be seen by observing the "Church News" department of some of our "periodicals." The spirit that was always manifested by Christ would instruct us that when the people are converted under the sound of our preaching, we "sound no trumpet," but that in the **stillness of our souls** we give God the praise. But this humiliating lesson which Christ taught is not much regarded now, for many of us **do love** to sound through our "papers," far and wide, the success that attends our preaching.

2. **"Sabbath-schools."** These schools in themselves present a very harmless and innocent appearance, and to many they may seem to be the means of much good, yet we must confess that their **tendency**, in short, is **pride and self-praise.** We find neither command nor example in the gospel for the establishment of such schools. The teaching of moral and religious lessons to our children is a Christian duty obligatory upon **all parents,** and should commence at home; hence the apostle admonishes us to "bring up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." See to it, O parents, that you discharge your duty in giving your children the proper instructions, and in setting before them examples worthy of imitation.

3. **"Prayer Meetings," "Social Meetings," and "Bible Classes."** We find no **scripture authority** for so many varieties of meetings. Their tendency, if closely observed, is a dangerous one, and **by no means** that of humility. Prayer, sociability, and the teaching of the scriptures, are among the principal features that should characterize ALL our meetings. These, with many other things that might be named, such as the way and manner in which our Annual Meetings are conducted, etc., etc., are of late years making **very rapid** inroads into our church; and it is a fact which we have had to observe, that most generally where the brethren have those new orders among them, fashionable dressing and pride (that abominable evil) are a natural consequence, and by some are even considered no harm.

These new things first originated among other denominations, and are in accordance with the general tenor and principles of their faith; but the tendency of these things does more or less conflict with the lessons of humility and self-denial, learned and ever held forth by the church of the brethren while in a state of simplicity, and were not introduced into her body while she strictly adhered to those lessons and continued in her humble state.

But, by and by, many of these new things were brought before our Annual Council Meetings, and that again and again, until finally the brethren gave way, and sanctioned them to a more or less extent. These things first presented themselves in a very harmless and plausible manner; but we tell you, brethren, all new things do scarcely, if ever, first appear in the form and habit of a lion. No; but like that of a lamb, and herein, dear brethren, lies the greater deception.

The most of denominations, when first set out, were a plain, self-denying people; but where are many of them now? So were our first brethren a plain and self-denying people; but where is our church now? Is she not rapidly following the same channel? Is not she too grasping and contending wonderfully for an **easy, pleasant,** and **popular** religion, in which there is less sacrifice and self-denial? Most assuredly so.

These, dear brethren, are FACTS which can not be disputed, and they are facts of which many of you are aware. What say you, brethren? Shall we say, **Amen?** Shall we quietly flow with the current and **remain silent?** Or shall we **even look on** and be content? Nay; verily, brethren, it will not do; we MUST sound the alarm; we MUST do our duty, if we would clear ourselves. While in the flesh we have a warfare, and if we would be **faithful** soldiers of Christ, **we must fight against wrong, should** it appear even in our very midst.

We, as God's "spiritual Israel," have become full of wounds, bruises, and putrefying sores that have not been closed; neither bound up; neither mollified with ointment. (See Isaiah i. 6.)

Paul says to Timothy, "But **continue** thou in the things which thou **hast learned** and hast been assured of, knowing of **whom** thou has learned them." (II. Timithy iii. 14.)

Hence we are opposed to these new movements and changes which are **continually** being introduced into our body; and we hereby request all our dear brethren everywhere, wherever this may come, that it and the petition attached be read at church meetings, and wherever an opportunity presents itself. Let all the brethren, and even sisters, too, who are favorably disposed, and who are yet **firm** in the order of the brethren as they had it in their **simplicity** many years ago, sign their names to the same. Let as many names, either private or in office, thus be added as can be had, after which let all be carried to the Annual Meeting, or if preferred, let it be forwarded in time to some of the brethren here, and they will carry it there. It would, however, be preferable to have all such petitions (after first passing through the church at home) go to the district meeting; but in case it is thought doubtful whether the district meeting would be favorable, it had better at once be forwarded to the Annual Meeting, or to the brethren here.

We believe there are yet many brethren in the churches who have not lost sight of the ancient order of our church, and we especially desire all to respond to this as soon as they can.

The brethren need not be alarmed, neither need they entertain the slightest fears in putting their names to this paper, and seeing we plead not for any **new thing** in which there may be danger, but for "Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls." (See Jeremiah vi. 16.)

The object of our labors, in short, is, by the favor of God, to UNITE the brotherhood upon the ancient principles of our church, and thus save her from a corrupted Christendom; and in order to awaken us to our duties we would **sound the alarm,** and that LOUD AND EARNESTLY, and thus cause **reformation** or COMING BACK to the ORIGINAL STANDARD of the brotherhood, and that there be as much accomplished as possible in this direction. The brethren in council on the 13th day of October, 1868, and again, the brethren in council on the 13th day of November, 1868 (whose names are attached to the petition), and we, the undersigned, again to-day do all most earnestly entreat our Annual Conference Meeting of 1869 to hear the accompanying petition, and to grant the requests therein stated, giving a definite reply, after which the steps necessary to be taken further will manifest themselves.

We, the undersigned, do hereby signify that we will be **firm** and **faithful** to that which is herein contained, and that we will be TRUE to each other "by evil report and good report."

After this supplement was read to the brethren and sisters at the above named meeting, one hundred and twenty-six of them signed their names to it, thus signifying that they are yet willing to walk in the light while they have it, as Christ directs.

Paul says, "For though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying and beholding **your order,** and the **steadfastness** of your faith in Christ. As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him, rooted and built up in Him, and established in the faith as ye have been taught abounding therein with thanksgiving. Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." (Col. ii. 5, 8.)

It was agreed that this supplement should be printed for general circulation among the brethren, and all who desire copies of it can obtain them by addressing Brother

SAMUEL KINSEY, Box 44, Dayton, Ohio.

The following is the answer to the above, or COMPROMISE MADE BY THE ANNUAL MEETING:

Whereas, there have been certain petitions from Southern Ohio presented to this Annual Meeting, and which have been extensively circulated through the brotherhood, wherein the petitioners have set forth certain grievances, and desire some change or modification in holding the Annual Meeting, and also in certain practices among the brethren; and, whereas, this Annual Meeting desires to maintain all the practices and ordinances of Christianity in their simplicity and purity, and to promote the "unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace;" therefore though it can not grant the changes and objects desired by the petitioners to the full extent petitioned for, it will make the following changes in the manner of holding the Annual Meeting, and endeavor to guard, with increased vigilance, against the abuse of the practices to observe the cautions and directions in reference to said practices, as hereinafter stated:

1. In relation to the appointing of the Standing Committees we advise that the district meetings select old, experienced, and established brethren; and that in signing the minutes we advise that a suitable number of elders sign them, but not as members of the Standing Committee, and the signers need not be confined to the committee.

We also advise that the minutes be read to all at the close of the meeting, provided there is time and it be found practicable to do so, and that the term "moderator," as applied to the brother who keeps order, be dropped.

2. In relation to holding protracted meetings for worship we feel much impressed with the propriety of conducting said meetings in strict accordance with the gospel; that all disorder and improper excitement should be avoided; that care should be taken that the understanding be enlightened as well as the passions awakened; that on all occasions, when candidates for church membership are visited and examined, they be dealt with as the gospel seems to require, and as the order of the brethren has sanctioned; that in noticing the success of preaching, we advise that the number of additions to the churches be omitted.

3. In relation to Sabbath-schools we feel the great necessity of guarding against the prevailing manner in which these schools are conducted; of cautioning the brethren who take any part in them against having festivals, or anything of the kind that does not comport with the spirit of Christianity, which such schools are designed to promote; that care be taken, lest pride be taught rather than humility, and that nothing be encouraged thereby that will conflict with the established order and character of the brethren, and that care should be taken that no offense be given to the brethren in these things.

4. In reference to the controversial articles published in our religious papers we counsel and advise our brethren Quinter and Kurtz and H. R. Holsinger, to publish nothing in their periodicals that disputes the practice of the precepts and ordinances of the gospel, as handed down to us from Christ and the apostles through and by the forefathers of the church; and that brethren Nead, Kinsey, and all the brethren who wrote, be cautioned upon this head, and are hereby given to understand that a disregard to this counsel will subject a brother to the council of the church.

5. In reference to prayer meetings, social meetings, and Bible classes, we would say that we advise the brethren to be very careful in conducting such meetings when they have been introduced, and to conduct them not after the prevailing custom of the religious world, but in the order that the brethren conduct their meetings for worship; that brethren be cautioned against introducing such meetings where their introduction

would cause confusion or trouble in the churches, and that elders always be consulted in introducing such meetings."

The meeting above referred to, on the 13th of November, was held in the Stillwater church, near Dayton, and the propriety of it first came into the minds of Elder Henry Kurtz and Elder Peter Nead, on a time when Brother Kurtz paid Brother Nead a visit; but, deeming it best to have a further consultation with the surrounding elders, the meeting of October 13th was appointed, which was held in the old brick house in the Wolf Creek Church.

It will be noticed that the first object of this petition was to reform the Annual Meeting from her worldly wise manner of doing business, her simplicity in Christ having even then well nigh departed.

In noticing the minutes of 1869, Article 1, as above given, it will be seen that there is some respect shown to this petition, but the request of the petition is not granted in full, and the objectionable things named in the supplement are still retained in the church. The petition did not come before the public meeting at all. The brethren, on presenting this petition to the Standing Committee, met with some opposition. But, although there was a spirit manifest to oppose this effort, it was somewhat respected, and did for some time keep in check, to some little extent, those opposing elements; but not long, and the condition of things in all these respects became more grievous to the old-order-minded members than before.

In the year 1871 there was an effort made to more fully unite the church on the practice of feet washing (this subject having been agitated in the brotherhood to such an extent, that in various parts thereof serious troubles arose). We here give the subject as may be seen in Minutes of 1871, Article 37: "Whereas, this Annual Meeting finds, to its great regret, that the subject of feet washing, in its single and double mode, as the difference is called, has produced serious difficulties already among us, and threatens still greater difficulties in the future. Questions relating to this subject have come from different localities in the brotherhood, and it has assumed such a degree of importance as to commend it to the serious and prayerful attention of the brotherhood. Under these considerations, with prayerful reflection, the propriety has suggested itself to us of calling the elders of the brotherhood together to consider this matter, as the apostles and elders did to consider the case of circumcision. (Acts xv. 5.) We have therefore concluded to request all the ordained elders of the brotherhood to meet in the fear of the Lord and under a sense of their responsibility in solemn assembly on Whit-Monday, 1872, at the place of our next Annual Meeting, to dispose of this subject as the peace and prosperity of the fraternity require. In the meantime, no church should be organized under the single mode, neither should any change from the double to the single mode. And in order to obtain all the information possible to present unto the council of elders above alluded to, we appoint the following brethren as a committee to ascertain, as far as possible, which was the first mode practiced by our brethren in America. D. P. Saylor, Jacob Reiner, and J. Quinter.

This subject being prayerfully considered as set forth in the aforesaid minutes, resolved itself into the decision and council of 1872. The following resolution contains the decision of the meeting upon the subject of feet washing: **"Make No change whatever in the mode and practice of feet-washing, and stop the further agitation of the subject."** (Article 17.)

From the above it is seen what is the recognized mode. This effort to unity on the subject of feet-washing had a good effect, causing some brethren who, previous to this, were inclined to some extent to favor the single mode to throw their entire influence in favor of the double mode. Although this effort did have a tendency to unity in the practice of feet-washing, there still remained in the church a spirit of insubordination. So in the year 1876 the subject was brought forward again. (See minutes, Article 25.) We here give it: "Several queries and requests relative to feet-washing being presented to the meeting, the following was prepared to meet the case: Whereas, the so-called double mode of feet-washing is the recognized mode of the general brotherhood; therefore, the Annual Meeting can not grant the liberty prayed for, and no church can change from the double to the single mode on the authority of the Annual Meeting." **Deferred.** By noticing the twenty-sixth Article of the same meeting (next query) a spirit of insubordination on the subject of feet-washing still existed.

In the year 1877 this subject is brought forward again, and the following disposition is made of it: As many brethren desire to wash feet by the single mode, will not this district meeting earnestly petition the Annual Meeting of 1877 to grant to any church of the brethren full liberty to wash by each member girding himself or herself, and both wash and wipe the feet of another, when it can be done in peace and harmony?" Answer: "Inasmuch as the so-called double mode of feet-washing is the order of the general brotherhood, this Annual Meeting can not sanction the practice of different modes; but those churches which wish to observe the single mode we will bear with, when it can be done unanimously and without giving any trouble or offense in the church. And as there are different views on this matter among the brethren, we would caution both members and ministers in going from one church to another, that they shall not agitate and stir up the minds of the brethren on the subject." (Article 24.)

Here we notice that there was liberty granted by Annual Meeting to practice the single mode of feet-washing, and though a caution was given not to urge a change to the dissatisfaction of any of the members as set forth above, the caution was not regarded, as the door was now opened, and changes were forced upon churches, and that to the displeasure of many members. Because of this change being introduced and forced upon members much trouble was caused in some local churches, that it was needful for Annual Meeting to send committees to settle the troubles so brought about by this change of washing feet from the old recognized double to the single mode; but it became a noticeable fact that these committees sent to settle these troubles and to bring about a union again did not reach the much-desired end, and the troubles in some churches were getting worse. The minority very frequently had to yield to the single mode, being overpowered by a majority. But efforts were still made by the brethren to bring about and retain union by sending requests and queries to Annual Meeting again and again.

In 1879 a petition was sent to the Annual Meeting at Broadway, Virginia, with the request that she do away with those changes and new movements which were more and more introduced, and that she cease giving encouragement and latitude to the things that were evidently destroying the union of the brotherhood. The Standing Committee would not suffer the paper to have a hearing, but with a sort of threat returned it. Hereupon all the official brethren present from the Miami Valley, of Ohio, who were desirous to have the church fall back to her ancient order of things, assembled in the grove north of the meeting grounds for consultation relative to the matter, and when it was said that a **threatening** accompanied the return of the paper, the bzrethren discovered that their grievances would not be heard, and that any further efforts at the time would be useless, and they quietly submitted.

Now, the treatment that these queries and petitions received impressed the minds of many members with the view that it was useless to expect that the Annual Meeting would adopt any measures by which to rid the church of the things which caused the trouble.

It seemed that at this time, and even before this time, the elders living in the Miami Valley, of Ohio, were mostly looked upon from many parts of the brotherhood to make a move, and in some way or other to take a stand against those innovations which caused trouble, and in places threatened division. The elders feeling that there was a great responsibility resting on them, and feeling also the work to be of importance, the matter was taken into council from time to time; consequently, in the year 1879 five brethren were appointed to correspond with the leading elders and members of other states for the purpose of obtaining the views of the brethren from different parts of the brotherhood as to what course best to pursue. Many letters were received and forms of petitions desirous to be presented to the Annual Meeting of 1880. (Here let it be well remembered that the elders of the Miami Valley were much urged by members living in the valley, and from other parts of the brotherhood, to take a firm stand against the worldly movements of the church.) Some of our leading brethren did then say, and that in print, that the "church was **shaking hands** with the world." Others said, "We can not expect anything from Annual Meeting."

In November, perhaps on the twenty-fifth day, nearly all the elders of the valley met in council in the Salem Church to read and consider the letters and petitions which had now been sent in. This consideration of the elders, after reading many letters and several petitions, resolved itself into what is known as the "Miami Valley, Ohio, Petition of 1880," which we here insert.

A Petition from the Elders of the Miami Valley to the District Meeting of Southern Ohio, for the Annual Meeting of 1880:

DEAR BRETHREN:—We do hereby most earnestly petition the Annual Meeting, through the district meeting, to consider the present condition of the church in her confused and divided state, and to make an effort by which may be removed the fast element from among us, which is the cause of the troubles and the division in the church.

Now, as all former efforts have failed, in sending query after query to the Annual Meeting, the exercising of patience and forbearance from time to time, all of which have accomplished but little, the so-called fast element gaining ground year after year, and one innovation after another being introduced among us, which if suffered to continue will lead the church off into pride and the popular customs of the world and the other denominations, we think we feel the propriety of a renewed effort on our part to accomplish the object of this petition.

We, in Southern Ohio, have of late years felt and observed the element more than ever, and in serious meditation have we felt the weight of Paul's language in I. Corinthians i. 10, and in I. Peter v. 12. We, as elders of the church, over which the Holy Ghost, we trust, has made us overseers, do feel that duty demands of us to make this effort, that we may have order, peace and union again restored among us. We offer the following as a remedy, in our wisdom and judgment, whereby a union can be effected: namely, to hold to and maintain the ancient and apostolic order of the church in her humility, simplicity, and non-conformity to the world. And we feel that we can no longer suffer or tolerate those innovations in the church of Christ. The **causes** of the troubles must be removed before peace and union can be restored; and among some of these causes are the high schools among us, popular Sunday-schools with their conventions and celebrations, long protracted meetings, and the way they are generally conducted, by singing revival hymns and giving invitations to rise or come forward, a salaried ministry, and the single mode of feet-washing.

Now the things here named we do not regard as being in harmony with the spirit of the gospel, neither are they in harmony with the ancient and apostolic order of our church, and when we speak of the ancient order of our church we have reference also to non-conformity to the world, not only in dress, but in the building and fancy painting of our houses, barns, etc., after the custom of the world, the gaudy and costly finish put on them, and fine furniture, etc., to set off our rooms and parlors after the fashions of the world, together with fine and costly carriages, etc. In these things we confess that Southern Ohio has gone too far out of the way, and we hope will be willing to reform and make any sacrifice for Jesus' sake.

1. With regard to high schools among us, we fear they will greatly operate against the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, as well as create or cultivate the desire for an educated ministry, which is not in harmony with the teachings of Christ and the apostles, nor with the ancient views of the church. Paul says, "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth." (I. Corinthians viii. 1.) "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate." (I. Corinthians i.) Again: "Be not wise in your own conceits." (Romans xii. 16.) The views of our brethren were in perfect harmony with the gospel as regards this matter, as will be seen by reference to the following queries and decisions:

Annual Meeting of 1831, Article 1. "Whether it was considered advisable for a member to have his son educated in a college? Considered not advisable, inasmuch as experience has taught that such very seldom will come back afterward to the humble ways of the Lord."

Annual Meeting of 1852, Article 12. "How is it considered by the brethren, if brethren aid and assist in building great houses for high schools, and send their children to the same? Considered that brethren should be very cautious, and not mind high things, but condescend to men of low estate." (Romans xii. 16.)

Annual Meeting of 1853, Article 28. "Is it right for a brother to go to college, or teach the same? Considered that we would deem colleges a very unsafe place for a simple follower of Christ, inasmuch as they are calculated to lead us astray from the faith and obedience to the gospel." And in 1857, when the subject again came up, the answer of the Annual Meeting is definitely given thus: **"It is conforming to the world.** Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth."

Thus we see that high schools were not permitted to come into the church for at least twenty-seven years after they were first urged.

2. Sabbath-schools we consider to be more of human origin than by command of Christ or his apostles, and hence are more of a worldly custom than of gospel principle and authority; are not in harmony with the apostolic order of the church, the principles of the gospel, and were never sanctioned by the Annual Meeting in the way many are and will be conducted. Paul says, "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring

them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Ephesians vi. 4.) This command is given to **parents,** and not to others.

3. Protracted or revival meetings, in the way they are generally conducted, are, we claim, not in harmony with the old order and the apostolic rules of the church. "And Paul, **as his manner was,** went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." (Acts xvii. 2.) Again: "And he reasoned in the synagogue **every Sabbath,"** etc. Again: "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the **next Sabbath."** (Acts xiii. 42.) "And the **next Sabbath-day** came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." (Verse 44.)

4. A salaried or paid ministry is also against the apostolic order. Hear Paul on this subject: "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel; yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me." (Acts 33: 34.) "What is my reward then? verily, that when I preach the gospel I may make the gospel without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel." (I. Corinthians ix. 18.) Again: Neither did we eat any man's bread for naught, but wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you." (II. Thessalonians iii. 8.) And when Christ sent out his disciples, he forbade them the carrying or providing of gold or silver in their purses. These were to constitute **no part of the** considerations of the labors before them.

5. And with regard to the subject of feet-washing, what method had we best adopt to provide against the troubles growing out of having different modes of performing the ordinances among us? We hereby recommend and pray that the decision of 1872 be readopted by this meeting. The subject was brought before the elders of that Annual Meeting, a committee had been appointed, and a careful investigation made for a final decision of the matter, and after this special investigation and a thorough examination of this matter the Annual Meeting decided to **"make no change whatever in the mode and practice of feet-washing, and stop the further agitation of the subject."** And in 1876, when it again came up, it was decided that "no church can change from the double to the single mode on the authority of the Annual Meeting."

Now, the decision of 1872 should, we think, have forever settled the feet-washing question, and to this we desire to hold as the order of the church, unless we can be convinced that the double mode is wrong, or that Christ will be pleased with different modes and practices of worship in his church. All do admit that the command is fulfilled by the ancient or general order, and why not abide by it? Why should we have such troubles in these last days with an ordinance that has so long stood under the blessings of God while the church prospered.

Dear brethren, in order to have permanent peace and union restored—which we hope all are praying for—we will have to deny ourselves of the recent inventions among us, and fall back and unite upon the principles of the gospel and the ancient principles and apostolic order of the church. Upon this we were all once united and satisfied until the innovations herein alluded to crept in among us, which are now disturbing our peace. Can we not, dear brethren, all acknowledge that we were not watchful and guarded enough in suffering those strange things to come into the church and repent for our want of faithfulness? **Forbearance,** we think, is the door by which these things came into church, one after another, and now it seems there is no door to be found by which to get them out again.

Do not, dear brethren, find fault with us, and conclude we are taking too much upon us. We have, with sorrowful hearts, looked upon the very fast drift and movement of things in the church; and as all efforts to exterminate from the church the things which mar our peace have thus far failed, we saw no better course than the one presented. Our plain decisions have been disrespected and overruled, and if this state of things shall continue to exist, we will lose all our power in the controlling of the church. We, for the present, can see no better plan by which to restore brotherly harmony and peace than to direct our efforts at the **causes** from whence the disunion arises.

Now, we pray, dear brethren, that this may receive your prayerful and serious consideration, and our wish and desires are that it may pass the Annual Meeting without any compromise. Conrad Brumbaugh, Emanuel Hoover, Samuel Garber, Abraham Flory, Jacob Miller, David Brumbaugh, David Murray, William Cassel, George V. Siler, Samuel Murray, Emanuel Miller.

The foregoing petition was agreed upon and signed by twelve elders at first and two more afterwards; one, however, of the first requested that his name be dropped, which was done. These elders being urged from various parts of the brotherhood, and especially by many members in the Miami Valley, to make this another effort by petitioning Annual Meeting, the petition was read before and was sanctioned by fifteen or more local churches that it should be forwarded to the District Meeting of Southern Ohio. It was so done, and the district meeting agreed to send it to the Annual Meeting of 1880, however not with the entire approval.

At the Annual Meeting there was a **substitute** formed by the Standing Committee which, though it made a plausible appearance to restrict certain things, was destined to **retain** in the church about all the petition wished to have done away, and consequently the answer did not give satisfaction. The substitute and its resolutions read as follows:

ARTICLE 23. Petition from Miami Valley, Ohio, was presented, and the following substitute was offered and accepted:

"WHEREAS, Our beloved fraternity has been considerably disturbed by the brethren holding extreme views, some being disposed to enforce more vigorously the order of the church in regard to non-conformity to the world, and the principle of non-conformity to the world in giving form to our costume, than has commonly been done by our ancient brethren; while some on the other extreme would abandon the principle of non-conformity so far as that principle has anything to do with giving form to our costume; and,

"WHEREAS, The principle of non-conformity in giving form to our costume, as well as in everything else, has been a peculiar characteristic of our fraternity, and is so stated in our written history, and has had its influence with our non-swearing, and non-combatant, and our general principles identifying our fraternity with the primitive and apostolic church in preserving us from the extravagant expenditures which both the religious and secular world have fallen into, and in obtaining for us as a body the characters of simple honesty, purity, and uprightness in the world; and,

"WHEREAS, It is thought by many, and even so declared, that as a body we are opposed to all improvement and progress; and, "Whereas, Contention and strife in the church are great obstacles in the way of both its holiness and its usefulness; therefore,

"**Resolved,** First, that we will labor in the spirit of the gospel and in brotherly love to maintain the principle of non-conformity in giving form to our costume, and in every way that the recognized peculiarities of our fraternity require.

"**Resolved,** Secondly, that while we declare ourselves conservative, in maintaining unchanged what may justly be considered the principles and peculiarities of our fraternity, we also believe in the propriety and necessity of so adapting our labor and our principles to the religious wants of the world as will render our labor and principles most efficient in promoting the reformation of the world, the edification of the world, and the glory of God. Hence, while we are conservative we are also progressive.

Resolved, Thirdly, that brethren teaching through the press or ministry, or in any way, sentiments conflicting with the recognized principles and peculiarities of our fraternity shall be considered offenders, and dealt with as such. And to specify more particularly the subject named in the petition, we offer the following as an answer:

"1. Inasmuch as there exists a widespread fear among us that the brethren's high schools are likely to operate against the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, as also to cultivate the desire for an exclusively educated ministry, to guard these schools, therefore, from producing these effects, we think the principals of these schools should meet and adopt rules that will prevent such tendency, and said rules be in harmony with the Annual Meeting.

"2. Sabbath-schools, when held in the spirit of the gospel, may be made the means of bringing up our children in the 'nurture and admonition of the Lord;' but should have no picnics and celebrations, or any vain things of the popular Sunday-schools of the day connected with them.

"3. All meetings for worship should be held as our stated or regular meetings are held, and we be cautious not to use such means as are calculated to get persons into the church without gospel conversion—such as over persuasion or excitement, simply to get them into the church—but use the gospel means to get them to turn away from sin.

"4. In regard to a paid ministry, we believe it is not right in the sense for brethren to go and labor for churches in the hope of receiving money for services, and the offer of money as an inducement to brethren to preach, but to poor ministers who are faithful, both in the doctrine and practice of the church, we would encourage giving toward their necessities, as also of defraying their expenses of traveling in attendance to church interests.

"5. Inasmuch as our old fathers have always admitted the validity of both modes of feet washing, and as much as we desire a more perfect union in this matter, we cannot condemn either mode as being invalid. And inasmuch as former decisions have failed to settle this to the satisfaction of all, we advise more forbearance and liberty to the conscience of our brethren in this matter, because both have been practiced among us, and the best way to stop the agitation of this question is to allow the same liberty of conscience for our brethren that we ask for ourselves. But this shall not be construed to annul the present decision and advice of Annual Meeting."

From this it will be seen that the Annual Meeting of 1880 did not read and act upon the petition itself, but the above "substitute" was made and presented to take its place. But the manner the petition is here disposed of, and the way in which the answers or resolutions coil around the high schools, Sunday schools, etc., so as still to retain these with the other grievances in the church, could not render satisfaction to the brethren, and, insead of putting these things **away,** it rather by these would-be restrictions, **recognizes** them as having a legal right in the church, which was thought was leaving things in a worse shape now than it was before.

And the terms the Annual Meeting here uses in defining her position, saying that, "While we are **conservative** we are also **progressive**" (which though very true, for that was the exact position of the Annual Meeting at that time, and is yet), was not satisfactory, for the brethren were praying to have he progressive movement **put away** and not retained.

And the term which the Annual Meeting uses with regard to feet washing, saying that "our fathers always **admitted the validity** of both modes of feet washing," was not considered exactly correct nor consistent. The fathers bore with or **suffered** the single mode where it existed, as it lay comparatively quiet then, not causing much trouble, but both the fathers and the

Annual Meeting until late years considered the double mode **the** mode and the only recognized mode, and hence the single mode was not considered strictly valid, or of equal propriety with the double mode.

And in concluding this matter the Annual Meeting says, "The best way to stop the agitation of this question is to allow the same liberty of conscience for our brethren that we ask for ourselves."

This, also, was very unsatisfactory to the brethren, for it was clearly seen that every effort the brethren made to Annual Meeting to get these things out, she gave them but the more foothold. "Liberty of conscience." This was thought was only kindling the fire for further disunion and contention—every one do as their conscience may choose to dictate! Conscience the guide! One of the most dangerous doctrines ever preached, and it came from the brethren's Annual Conference Meeting. The tendency, if the "conscience' 'may be a guide in one of the Lord's ordinances, it may be the same in another, and where, in such an order of things, can exist the Lord's people who are to be of "one mind" and "speak the same things?"

The brethren were by this time very nigh discouraged, and it was by many now declared as entirely useless and fruitless to go to Annual Meeting any more.

It was also discovered that the church was still more inclined to depart from her former established practices. We were informed by letter thus: (Speaking of a certain state district, composed of about eighteen or twenty local districts) "Here, as yet, all the churches practice the double mode; **but,"** says the writer, " my impression is that in a year or two they will change solidly to the single mode. The drift of sentiment,' says he, "is settling strong in Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Northern Missouri, Kansas, and the East, toward the single mode.

Such a state of feeling existed in 1880, after the petition had been before Annual Meeting. It becoming manifest that the way it was disposed of did not, in this least, check the disturbing element. And not much wonder when it is said in the substitute in answer to the petition, **"While we are conservative, we are also progressive."**

About this time also other grave departures were not only thought of and advocated, but actually practiced. We will here **cite a few. First, the reporting of sermons.** This was indulged in by some of our leading brethren, taking their reporters and have them note their speeches as delivered to the audience, and afterwards published in their periodicals. This matter of making a public report even at our Annual Meeting was in former years not allowed, and brethren who are now at the head of the Annual Meeting take the liberty, when they go to their regular meetings, to have their sermons noted. In the year of 1870 a brother was severely censured and corrected for having brought a reporter, at his own expense, to the Annual Meeting of 1869, but now it is done every year, and the Annual Meeting says nothing against it. Their conscience allows them to do now what they would not allow H. R. Holsinger to do at first—in 1869.

Sunday-schools and Sunday-school conventions were at this time also more strongly advocated than ever, and it was clearly seen that the state of things were becoming more corrupt and determined continually.

Now, the way the aforesaid petition was disposed of, and the manner that things were moving in general, gave rise to a notice for a special council, as noted in the **Vindicator** of 1880, page 378. We give it here: "Having learned that many brethren in different localities and states think there should be a consultation of the brethren in order to learn the minds of one another, to know if all can be satisfied with the disposition that the Annual Meeing made of the Miami Valley petition, and if not, to learn what course would be thought best to be pursued for the good of the church, we have therefore agreed, after having had considerable correspondence with brethren in other states, and after having convened together in the fear of the Lord on the 9th day of November, 1880, to appoint a meeting for special consultation, to be held with the brethren in the Wolf Creek Church, Montgomery County, Ohio, on the 8th day of December next, to which all our faithful and steadfast brethren —both in the ministry and at the visit—who are in favor of the **ancient and apostolic order of the church, as set forth in said petition,** are most heartily invited. Brethren coming by railroad will stop off at Brookville, on the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati & St. Louis Railroad, about twelve miles west of Dayton. Brethren coming from other states beforehand are invited to stop and visit adjoining churches, if convenient. It will, of course, not be expected that any of those who have been expelled in any of the states will take part in the deliberations of the meeting. Signed by Abraham Flory, Samuel Garber, David Murray, Samuel Mohler, Wm. Cassell, G. V. Siler, Samuel Murray, Emanuel Hoover. The brethren's papers will please copy.

We give this notice to show that the brethren in the Valley did not aim to take this into their own hands, but that a general consulation might be had. The meeting of the 8th of December was well attended by the leading brethren from different states, and after deliberating for nearly three days it was concluded that the Miami Valley petition again go to Annual Meeting. And it was moved by D. P. Saylor, that, with regard to feet-washing, the Annual Meeting shall be asked to fall back to her decision of 1872. It was decided that the petition shall go **direct** from this meeting to Annual Meeting. It was so agreed on and advised by the leading men of the Annual Meeting.

Minutes of the Miami Valley Council and the Petition

At this special or great council meeting held with the brethren of the Wolf Creek Church, on the 8th, 9th, and 10th of December, 1880, brethren from the various states being assembled, the following resolution with regard to the subject of feet-washing, after the evils of the present manner of observing it were fully considered, was proposed and passed the meeting unanimously:

Resolved, That with regard to the mode of feet-washing, we ask the Annual Meeting of 1881 to re-adopt the decision of 1872, and repeal all decisions made since then that do in any wise favor or encourage the single mode. This resolution to be sent to the Annual Meeting of 1881 for confirmation.

The question was asked the meeting, Whether brethren had the right to petition the Annual Meeting and to sign the same. Answered that they had the right to do so and sign it, of course.

Question 2,.. Asked if the committee of last year authorized any brethren to go abroad, out of their own territory, to ordain two brethren. The brethren present of the last Standing Committee said they gave no such privilege.

Question 3. Is such a course legal? Answered that adjoining elders should be consulted in all such cases, and that if such work was done, it was illegal, and the elders are not bound to recognize it.

A decision of Southern Illinois was read on the same subject, which gives it as wrong to do so. It was, therefore, decided that, WHEREAS, Offense has been given to churches by elders going from home and ordaining brethren without consulting the elders of the adjoining churches in which the ordination is made, and contrary to the general order of the brethren; therefore,

Resolved, That all elders be admonished not to do as above stated until next Annual Meeting, when the duties of elders in regard to this work will be more definitely defined.

A supplement to the Miami Valley petition was read, but it was concluded to consider the petition first.

Commencing at the petition the subject of high schools was first read. It was found that one great objection to these schools was, that some have assumed the authority to call them and advertise them as the "Brethren's School," when the Annual Meeting never gave them such authority.

Query 1. With regard to high schools among us, we fear they will operate greatly against the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, as well as create or cultivate the desire for an educated ministry, which is not in harmony with the teachings of Christ and the apostles, nor with the ancient views of the church. Paul says, "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth." (I. Cor. viii. 1.) "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate." (I. Cor. i.) Again, "Be not wise in your own conceits." (Rom. xii. 16.) The views of our brethren were in perfect harmony with the gospel as regards this matter, as will be seen by reference to the following queries and decisions:

Annual Meeting of 1831. Article 1. "Whether it was considered advisable for a member to have his son educated in a college? Considered not advisable, inasmuch as experience has taught that such very seldom come back afterward to the humble ways of the Lord."

Annual Meeting of 1852. Article 12. "How is it considered by the brethren if brethren aid and assist in building great houses for high schools, and then send their children to the same? Considered, that brethren should be very cautious, and not mind high things, but condescend to men of low estate." (Rom. xii. 16.)

Annual Meeting of 1853. Article 28. Is it right for a brother to go to college, or teach the same? Considered, that we would deem colleges a very unsafe place for a simple follower of Christ, inasmuch as they are calculated to lead us astray from the faith and obedience of the gospel." And in 1857, when the subject again came up, the answer of the Annual Meeting is definitely given thus: **"It is conforming to the world.** Knowledge puffeth us, but charity edifieth."

Thus we see that high schools were not permitted to come into the church for at least twenty-seven years after they were first urged; therefore,

Resolved, That this meeting petition the Annual Meeting of 1881 to re-adopt the answer to Query 28, of 1853, with the following amendment: **"It is conforming to the world,** and repeal all the decisions that have been made that favor high schools conducted amongst us by the brethren." The above passed the meeting almost unanimously.

Query 2. Sabbath-schools we consider to be more of human origin than by command of Christ or his apostles, and hence are more of a worldly custom than of gospel principle and authority; are not in harmony with the apostolic order of the church, the principles of the gospel, and were never sanctioned by the Annual Meeting in the way many are and will be conducted. Paul says, "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. vi. 4.) This command is given to **parents,** and not to others; therefore,

Resolved, That we petition our next Annual Meeting to withdraw the right of holding Sunday-schools in the brotherhood.

Passed nearly unanimously.

Query 3. Protracted or revival meetings, in the way they are generally conducted, are, we claim, not in harmony with the old order and the apostolic rules of the church. "And Paul, **as his manner was,** went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." (Acts xvii. 2.) "And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the gentiles besought that these words be preached to them the **next Sabbath."** (Acts xiii. 42.) "And the **next Sabbath-day** came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God. (Verse 44.)

Resolved, That this meeting petition Annual Meeting to revise the answer of Article 3 of the petition, so as to read **and we be not allowed** to use, instead of the words "be cautious."

Passed unanimously.

The answer as revised will read thus: "All meetings for worship should be held as our stated or regular meetings are held, and **be not allowed** to use such means as are calculated to get persons into the church without gospel conversion—such as over persuasion or excitement, simply to get them into the church, but use the gospel means to get them to turn away from sin."

Query 4. A salaried or paid ministry is also against the apostolic order. Hear Paul on this subject: "I have coveted no man's silver or gold, or apparel; yea, ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me." (Acts 33: 34.) "What is my reward, then? Verily, that when I preach the gospel I may make the gospel without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel." (I. Cor. ix. 18.) Again, "Neither did we eat any man's bread for nought, but wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you." (II. Thess. iii. 8.) And when Christ sent out his disciples he forbade them the carrying or providing of gold or silver in their purses. These were to constitute **no part** of the considerations of the labors before them.

Resolved, That this meeting urge the elders of our fraternity to carry out the decision as given by the last Annual Meeting, which is as follows:

In regard to a paid ministry, we believe it is not right in the sense for brethren to go and labor for churches in the hope of receiving money for services, and the offer of money as an inducement to brethren to preach, but to poor ministers who are faithful both in the doctrine and practice of the church, we would encourage giving toward their necessities, as also of defraying their expenses of traveling in attending to church interests.

The above being disposed of the condition of many of the members in parts of the brotherhood was considered, and it was further,

Resolved, That by the general voice of this meeting we advise our brotherhood to bear with all our brethren and sisters in the several localities who have been threatened by a majority who, perhaps, have limited their time—members who seem to want to abide by the general order and the petition, and against whom there is no individual charge existing. The united voice of this meeting is to bear with all such until the Annual Meeting shall consider the business of this meeting; and we further advise that all those who have been expelled for holding the sentiments in the Miami Valley petition shall be held as members of the church, and that they shall not be held to acknoweldge simply for holding those views.

Query

With regard to the present missionary plan, with its "Board of Directors," etc., we are not in full harmony with, and do therefore offer the following:

That we ask the Annual Meeting of 1881 to recall said decision of last year, in which we fear a paid ministry is encouraged, and urge it earnestly upon the brotherhood to be more actively engaged in spreading the truth amongst us, and to all as much as can be done, but in a more simple manner, after the pattern and advice of the church as given us heretofore.

Decided by this special council that this query shall be first presented to the district meeting.

The conduct of the brethren generally and the spirit of humility and Christian courtesy manifested during the time of this meeting was commendable, and had, we trust, its good effects. The special call for this meeting was by many thought to have been quite needful, and it is hoped that its salutary effects would be felt and appreciated by all.

By order of the meeting.

SAMUEL KINSEY.

Kinsey's Station, Montgomery Co., Ohio

Accordingly this petition was handed to the Standing Committee. But now these same Annual Meeting brethren who, on December 8th, helped and said it should go up begin to draw back, saying that it did not come there legal and would likely be objected to; so it was not permitted to come before the general council for consideration in the way it was agreed upon by these leading brethren, but was declared illegal. None of the leading brethren who helped to send the petition up again did defend it before the meeting save one; and not only was this petition thus rejected as illegal, but the following was passed against it at the same meeting:

"ARTICLE 22. **Resolved,** That the decision in regard to what is called the Miami Elders' Petition is as near right as any that can be reached upon the questions embodied in said petition, and the prosperity of the brotherhood demands that said decision of Annual Meeting of 1880 remain unchanged."

In the spring of 1880 the brethren of the Dry Creek Church, Iowa, presented a petition similar in substance to the one from the Miami Valley, and passed it through the Middle District of Iowa to the Annual Meeting, but it got no further than to the Standing Committee.

In rejecting the Miami Valley petition, and then passing the foregoing resolution against it, and that by some of the leading brethren of the Annual Meeting who had agreed at the December 8th meeting that it should go up direct from there and have a hearing, did now fully settle and confirm the idea and lamentable fact that nothing could ever be expected from the Annual Meeting that would do away with the innovations which caused the trouble and threatened division. Here was laid the **cause** which was now **fully ripe** for a movement to afford relief. Here many of the fathers and members over great portions of the brotherhood, who felt to hold on to the former practice and usages of the church were not only disappointed, but much discouraged, and viewed it as useless and a waste of time and effort any more to go to Annual Meeting, and to quietly settle down with folded arms and see the church still more drift into a state of apostacy and general corruption they could not, and hence, inasmuch as the petition was rejected by Annual Meeting and did remain in the hands of the petitioners, notice was given through the **Vindicator** that a meeting would be held with the brethren in the Ludlow and Painter Creek Church, near Arcanum, Darke County, Ohio, on the 24th day of August, 1881. The object of that meeting was stated thus: "The meeting is intended for all the faithful part of the church in the various states and localities, that they may consult with regard to the necessary provisions for the preservation of a unanimity of sentiment in faith and practice, the purity of the church," etc. The day arrived and the meeting was well attended, brethren and sisters from various states being present. The meeting was opened by singing

"Come Holy Spirit heavenly Dove,
With all Thy quickening power."

After an appropriate exhortation and prayer the seventeenth chapter of John was read. After a few brief exhortations on the chapter the object of the meeting was stated. The state and condition of the church was stated, and the efforts made by the brehren for years to bring about a better state of affairs, having failed at the Annual Meeting—not the satisfaction rendered to meet the desired ends. It was stated, "This meeting has been called that a remedy may be arrived at by which to restore the desired object. A unanimity of sentiment is desired and should be had if possible."

Up to about the middle of day an interchange of views and the state and condition of the church in various parts of the brotherhood, together with what would be best to do, were the topics under consideration. About 1:00 P. M. the deliberations were resumed, and the following resolutions were proposed as a remedy:

Resolutions passed at the Special Conference, held with the brethren of the Ludlow and Painter Creek Church, near Arcanum, Ohio, August 24, 1881:

After a careful hearing of the present condition of the church from the brethren of Ohio, and from those that were present from other states, the following paper, with its resolutions, was considered and passed:

DEAR BRETHREN:—It is manifest that our church is in a confused condition, and that duty requires something to be done for the peace and union of our church. There is a spirit or element amongst us which is disturbing the peace. Our dear old brethren have borne it all patiently for about thirty years. Up to the year 1851 peace and union existed in the church. In the year 1851 the first paper was granted to be printed amongst us. In 1857 Sunday-schools were rather granted. In 1858 liberty was granted for long revival meetings and also high schools. These somewhat disturbed the peace of many brethren. Thus we clearly see that when the order of the church was once broken, one new innovation and deviation after another crept in amongst us to the sorrow of many brethren and sisters.

Two ways of observing the ordinances of the house of God also crept in amongst us, greatly disturbing the peace and union of the church. First—The supper was put on the table at the time of feet-washing. After a little some also wanted the bread and wine on the table at the same time. And now, also, two or three ways are suffered in practicing the ordinance of feet-washing. And the single mode is also strongly advocated, and was very nearly granted by the Annual Meeting of 1880. Money soliciting and begging is also granted, and what next the Lord only knows.

Dear brethren, do we not clearly see that we are fast drifting into the popular customs of the world? Thus far our old brethren have suffered themselves to be led along until they feel to be led no farther in this current. So far they have borne all these things patiently, but have made many efforts by sending query after query to Annual Meeting, which accomplished but little in checking this fast element among us. A mild and friendly petition was sent to the Annual Meeting of 1880, praying that body to grant the request therein asked for. But instead of that they framed an unsatisfactory substitute with an answer. After a close investigation of that substitute and answer, many brethren considered it to be unscriptural with its answer, and we think it has been a cause of divisions in the church. Many brethren and sisters were, therefore, not satisfied with it, and so we sent it to the Annual Meeting again in 1881, when it was rejected and made out illegal with the council of December 8, 1880. Many tender feelings were wounded in looking over these proceedings, and hence are discouraged in making any further efforts or requests to this body, which, of late years, has been so much controlled by the fast element that it looks like as if the old brethren are but little regarded.

Now, dear brethren, you need not wonder or fault us, when we feel to be led no further in this popular current, and hence have made this another effort in calling a council to effect something for the peace and union of our church, to try and agree upon some rule or order for the Brethren's Church in the future. And we see no safer plan than to adhere more strictly to the ancient order of the church as practiced by the ancient fathers of the church, which we believe was in strict harmony with the spirit of the gospel, and in which a number of our churches were organized—in the same faith once delivered unto the saints, and hence about all believed in the universal practice of our ancient brethren, with a few exceptions.

Be it, therefore, **Resolved,** That we will more strictly adhere to the self-denying principles of the gospel, as practiced by our ancient brethren, and as set forth in our petition of 1880, to which we wish to hold. With this amendment as the petition mentions popular Sunday-schools, and revival meetings the way they are generally conducted, to be more clearly understood, we say that we feel to suffer none in the Brethren's Church, and then we will be sure to have no trouble with them. No Sunday-schools, no high schools, no revival meetings, no paid ministry, no missionary plans or mission boards, as now granted by Annual Meeting. No money soliciting or begging to carry out such plans. No single mode of feet washing, no musical instruments, as pianos, melodians, and organs, etc. No unlawful interest to oppress the poor.

Resolved, Further, that we fully adhere to primitive Christianity as taught by Christ and his apostles in all his commandments and precepts, as practiced by our forefathers (the first above named things we do not understand as belonging to primitive Christianity as taught by Christ and his apostles), and that we strictly adhere to a plain and decent uniformity of dress as soldiers of King Immanuel; that the brethren wear a plain, round-breasted coat with standing collar, hat, overcoat, and everything else to correspond. A plain way of wearing the hair and beard—no fashionable mustaches and no roached or shingled hair. The sisters also to wear a plain, modest dress and bonnet, also a plain white cap in time of worship or on going abroad; in short, that the brethren and sisters let their light shine as a light on a "candlestick," and not part or wholly under the "bushel," but to show to the world that we try to possess what we profess. And above all that brethren and sisters be more upon their guard and more reserved in their conversation, as that "unruly tongue is doing much mischief against us."

Now the above-named things we claim are in strict harmony with the spirit of the gospel, and thus we should strictly adhere to and fulfill our baptismal vow, which we made before God and many witnesses. Also, we look upon our many periodicals the way they are conducted as being very injurious to the cause of our Master.

We are by no means opposed to mission-work, if carried out in gospel order. Neither are we opposed to assist our poor ministers in such work; and when we speak of carrying out the ancient order of our church, we do not mean all little usages and customs that were amongst our people then, but to be more of "one mind" and speak and teach more the one and same thing as taught by the apostle. (Read Romans xii. 12, 16, 17; Galatians i. 6, 7, 8, and 9; Thessalonians iii. 6; I. Timothy vi. 5; II. Timothy iii. 5; Titus i. 10, 11; Second Epistle of John x. 11; II. Corinthians vi. (latter part of chapter); Revelation ii. 14, 15, 20; Revelation xviii. 4, etc.)

Now, after this resolution is accepted, we advise that all our members be counseled in every church in the valley, and in all other districts of our brotherhood that unite with us. Do the same to get the minds of the members. And we advise that two faithful and impartial elders be present at those councils, as we want nothing but honesty and fairness. But first, before any council is gone into, the members should be well instructed and enlightened in every point, showing no partiality nor forbidding brethren to give their opinion in love on both sides. After the members are well enlightened, let each member express his own mind, that a fair decision may be made, so we can learn how many will stand united to the ancient order of our church; and if some should ask time to consider, let it be granted them. To such the door of the church is open. But such as will express themselves not willing to stand united with the ancient order of our church, we could not help them, and if they would afterwards change their minds and wish to unite with us, they will then have to enter legally according to order, the door of the church to be open for them also; but such as will not stand united with us in the apostolic order of our church, would then have to be disfellowshiped from the old brethren's church.

Signed in behalf of the meeting by the following elders: Abraham Flory, Jacob Miller, David Murray, Emanuel Hoover, George V. Siler, Emanuel Miller, David Wise, Stephen Metzger, Samuel Garber, Nathan Haywood, Conrad Brumbaugh, William Cassel, Joseph Arnold, Jacob Metzger, Samuel Musselman.

However, before the foregoing resolutions were submitted for adoption considerable was said by a few brethren against the propriety of adopting them, although it was unanimously admitted that these resolutions were in harmony with the former usages of the brotherhood. It was also intimated, in answer to a question, that all those who would vote to stand by these resolutions would absent themselves from the then acknowledged Annual Meeting, which fact we think was well understood that such would be the case, unless the Annual Meeting party would come back and do away with the innovations as set forth in said resolutions. After considerable was said for and against the move of adopting the proposed resolutions by way of enlightening the members, a rising vote was taken, and a large number of members of both brethren and sisters rose up in favor of the resolutions being adopted, and it was so.

THE EFFECT

We will now proceed to give a brief sketch of how the adoption of the aforesaid resolutions affected the general brotherhood. But we will, in the first place, call the attention of the reader to consider well the **intention and purpose** of the resolutions.

First, it is seen that the intention was to rid the church of the innovations and movements as set forth in the various petitions and in the resolutions, and bring it back to former usages.

Second, and it is seen that no **compulsory** measures shall be resorted to; no coercive means to be used; nothing but fairness to be desired and practiced; and no member to be required to take their stand until a fair chance is given to be fully enlightened, if so need be, and then each choose for themselves. Time is to be given to each one to consider whether they wish to stand in fellowship with those who tolerate those innovations and deviations from the old order which caused this division, or whether they wish to stand with those who have now resolved to no longer go with that party who advocate and practice the departures from the ancient faith of the church. So each member could act from volition of mind, whether to stand identified with the new things as brought into the church, or from choice go with those who have now renounced them. Such a course, under these circumstances, was thought would be neighborly, brotherly, and Christian.

But instead of this course being pursued the same evening, perhaps after the resolutions were adopted, plans were already talked of by the opposers as to how they might defeat this work; and in a few days it was discovered that there was formed a party designated as the "conservative" Annual Meeting brethren. These at once and in haste commenced operations on rather rash and coercive principles. One-sided visits were ordered to members, and councils appointed without precedent or gospel authority. The work was carried on in this wise: Young brethren did hastily, without counseling their elders who had the oversight of them and the churches for years, and who had labored faithfully in building up the good cause, send visits and arraign thus their elders and others before councils, making them out as evil doers, obtaining judgment against them, casting them out that it might be fulfilled as the scripture saith, "Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall **separate you** from their company, and shall reproach you, and **cast out your** name as evil." And no doubt some of those who were now so very busy in working behind their old brethren's backs in this of appointing councils and bringing those fathers and mothers into judgment for no other question than the part they took in petitioning Annual Meeting, and wishing to indorse and stand by the resolutions, did so, that they might quickly scare, crush, and kill out the work of August 24th; for some did afterwards, when closely questioned, confess to that effect.

But thank the Lord the brethren still live! The severer the treatment the firmer the brethren become. Every notch they made convinced the brethren but the more, and made them but the stronger. The Lord's ways are not man's ways. They first introduced changes and new orders into the church which **caused** the division, and now in their blind zeal they finish it. It seemed as though the Lord used them as instruments by which to accomplish the work of giving relief to his faithful few who were "groaning and paining to be delivered."

But there were exceptions. There were certain leaders who went from church to church, carrying on this sort of work, while there were hundreds who were and still are of a neutral inclination. Some did what they did because they knew no better at the time, and have regretted it since. In some churches six or seven only stood for the old way at first, but soon increased to thirty or forty. In others sixty or seventy, but soon increased to double the number. Many stood back "for fear of the Jews," but in nearly all the states are they continually coming over to the old landmarks as fast as they can have the self-denial and fortitude to do so. It is however just here to say that these young brethren were encouraged to go on with this kind of work by certain rashly minded elders from other parts, who chanced to be in the valley at the time. On the 2d day of September (only nine days after the resolutions were passed) was a council meeting held in the same church where the resolutions were passed. Here the elder, two ministers, three visiting brethren, and a goodly number of members were already expelled for wishing to stand by the ancient usages of the church as set forth in the resolutions. Some were denied the privilege of giving their reasons in full why they preferred standing with the old order part of the church (it seemed as there were now two parts becoming manifest). Advantages were taken and unfairness was manifest in this council as well as in getting it up, for much was said to **intimidate** members; so much so that many felt afraid and did not act out their convictions of right immediately. This unfair and one-sided hasty work was carried on in most of the churches where there were any that dared to say they wished to stand with the old order part of the church. In some churches fifty and more were expelled at one time. Ministers and even old faithful elders, with all who wished to stand by the resolutions and could no longer fellowship the innovations, were forbidden the privilege to preach and worship in the church houses which their own hands had helped to build, offering them not a farthing of remuneration, nor any proposal of compromise; and instead of pointing to the gospel and "provide things honest in the sight of all men," they pointed to the supreme courts.

In places where the keys were held by the old brethren part new locks were put on by the Annual Meeting brethren, when at the same time the brethren proposed to open the house alternately or divide amicably; but all this did not satisfy them. This assumption of power of locking church houses was generally held and urged by the official part. The laity had very little or no say in the matter. This domineering power also assumed to say, even in public, that all those ministers they had expelled would subject themselves to a fine of five hundred dollars, if they did solemnize marriages, while the county judges who know the causes of separation said **not so,** but tell the brethren to go on as usual, we will recognize your work, which they did do.

Now, this public announcement that the old brethren could not legally solemnize marriages was no doubt purposely so said, that the prophetic language of Paul to Timothy might be fulfilled—"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith . . . **forbidding to marry."**

Many things were said at these expelling councils to intimidate and break down this reform work, and it was even intimated at several councils that it might come to pass that if those who were expelled were not careful they might be put into the ban. Loud predictions were made that this reform work of the brethren would soon come to naught—referring to factions who had been expelled and gone off years before for some of the very same new things that are now tolerated by this Annual Meeting party.

At some places the resolutions were read and pronounced very bad, and at some places they were pronounced good. Questions were so differently put to the members that many did not know how to answer. At one of those councils the reading of the resolutions was ruled out, so ordered by the elder in charge of said congregation, and yet the issue was to stand by the resolutions or remain with the general brotherhood and its Annual Meeting, the church not knowing as a body what was set forth in the resolutions.

This severing of the churches in this rash manner, and locking of church houses, and grasping all the church property, expelling of elders, ministers, and some of the most faithful members, commenced in a few days after the meeting of August 24th, as already stated, and in about six or eight weeks twelve or fifteen church districts were visited in the Miami Valley, and all shared the same treatment. In the meantime the same kind of work had already been learned in Indiana, and was going on there. In this limit of time hundreds were expelled, and nearly all the church property taken, and the doors locked against them, the brethren making no resistance, but endeavored to bear it with patience. Much more could be said by way of setting forth the unfairness and harsh treatment manifested by this expelling party, but we forbear.

It is just to say that some who took an active part in this expelling of the old fathers and mothers in Israel, together with others that wished to stand to the former usages of the church, as set forth in the petitions and resolutions, did at first work with the brethren, signed the petitions, and urged the elders to come upon some plan to take a firm stand against those innovations, but afterwards changed their course, which, after helping and urging that a stand be taken, looked a little hard to see them turn as they did, and act a conspicuous part in putting down the very thing they at first helped to bring about. Others talked strong that something would have to be done for the church, but when it came to the point they turned back.

After this expelling and locking of church houses was principally done, it occurred to the minds of some that their work should be ratified by their Annual Meeting. Accordingly in the spring of 1882—perhaps five or six months after their work was done or rather well under way—a petition was presented to their Annual Meeting, which reads as follows:

"WHEREAS, Certain elders and others became aggrieved at our Annual Meeting in her manner of doing business, and also at some of her decisions, and hence have framed certain resolutions in which are set forth the cause of their aggrievances;

and on the 24th of August, 1881, they met together from different states in the Ludlow and Painter Creek Church, Darke County, Ohio, where those resolutions were read, and some remarks made upon their merits, etc.; and after an explanation by their foreman, when he said 'that all who vote for these resolutions separate themselves from the general brotherhood and its Annual Meeting,' they then took a rising vote to ascertain who were willing to accept their resolutions, thereby causing a division in the brotherhood, and especially in southern Ohio, hence bringing about a necessity for the elders and officers of the church, who were still willing to stand by the general order and usages of our Annual Meeting, to bring the matter before their local churches, where all that have gone with the resolutions were excommunicated from the church; therefore

Resolved, That we ask Annual Meeting, through district meeting, to indorse the action of the churches in southern Ohio and elsewhere in regard to those who have gone with the resolutions, and also to enter the same upon the minutes." Answer: "This Annual Meeting does endorse the action of the churches which expelled the members who accepted the resolutions referred to above." (Article 13.) This resolution passed their meeting without inquiry or explanation. (See their full report. One who gave such advice was the first to move to pass it.)

Inasmuch as we have already set forth with what kind of spirit this expelling was done, and how unchristianlike those who were expelled were treated, and as we also gave the causes, we will here only call to mind a few things on this action of Annual Meeting indorsing this work: First, it would have looked more intelligent upon the part of the meeting if this matter would have been brought to light before a vote was taken; it being a fact well known that but few, comparatively speaking, of that Annual Meeting understood the real issue of the causes of this expulsion, or how it was done. Second, it is just to state that this Annual Meeting did pass a decision in the early part of its deliberations, making its decisions **mandatory** (see Article 5), and then they ratify this expelling and house-locking without bringing before that body what was done, and how those who were expelled were treated. This shows advantage-taking and unfairness, and it **binds,** according to the mandatory clause, those who did not have a full knowledge of what was done, having no chance to know, because the question was not explained before it was passed.

But after all this expelling and closing of churches, denying of solemnizing marriages was done, it did not stop the work on the part of those who were thus ruthlessly dealt with. Church-houses of other denominations, private houses, barns, and schoolhouses were offered to the brethren, and in fields and groves congregations would meet to hear those preach who were thus formerly expelled, and so the good work went on, and in a short time hundreds came out from this "conservative" party, and united with those who had thus been set out. Some who had helped in the work of expelling afterwards saw their mistake, came and asked pardon, and also joined in with them.

On the 25th day of November, 1881, according to appointment previously made, a goodly number of the old order part of the church—as they were now called—met at the barn of Brother Abraham Landis in the Salem Church, Montgomery County, Ohio, for counsel, and there decided to use the word **old** in connection with **German Baptist Brethren,** setting forth their position and desires for the old church worship, and to designate them from the **new,** or those who introduced and admitted new measures into their body; also for the purpose of writing deeds and giving certificates of membership, for it was understood already for some years that those who contended for the old practices of the church were known as the "old brethren," or the "old order brethren." Here also were made arrangements for the Yearly Meeting, which was held at Brookville, Ohio, on Pentecost, of the year 1882. Arrangements were also here made to send brethren to other states, east and west, to help those who had been oppressed, and had made urgent appeals to the brethren of the valley for assistance. Suffice it here to say that many were found in the several states who had not enjoyed fellowship for several years, because of the innovations which could not be sanctioned by all, and which finally caused this division. It is but just to state here that in this arrangement—to visit such who had made appeals—a body of members were found in the East who had previous to the day of Pentecost, 1881, separated themselves from the innovations tolerated by the general brotherhood and its Annual Meeting, and who had convened in council in Frederick County, Maryland, on Pentecost, 1881; and it was seen from their minutes that they in council were a united body, and labored to bring about that unity which formerly existed in the Brethren Church. This body numbered nearly five hundred members. The visit to them was made at their urgent request, and was much appreciated and enjoyed by them, and they once co-operated with the old brethren of the Miami Valley and the western states at the Yearly Meeting to fall back to the old order of the church.

The congregations of the old order brethren were soon in working order on the old platform, as set forth in the resolutions and petitions, and at the meeting on Pentecost, 1882, churches were represented from nine different states. Here, in order to place on record the very severe opposition that their opposers manifested, it may not be amiss to state that we were, by the legal authorities, informed that they sought advice to know if the brethren could not be stopped from holding their Yearly Meeting; but the judge said to them, "No;" that the Constitution of the United States granted all believers the free right of worship. Equal to this it may also be proper to state that at one of their council meetings, where they were putting on new locks during the services, or about that time, to keep the brethren out, one of their elders arose and said he believed it to be their duty to do all they could to keep the old brethren from preaching. This language fully convinced one certain brother who heard it, and he left the meeting. Such was the bitterness and trying opposition the brethren had to contend against at this time; but it seemed they prospered but the more. The brethren's Yearly Meeting was well attended from the different parts of the brotherhood, and many members were in attendance. The business was done harmoniously, and in a way these meetings were held in days of yore.

At this time the brethren's congregations were increasing in some localities by members coming and identifying themselves with the old brethren, doubling and tripling the number that first came out, that it became needful to build meeting-houses again in some localities for the accommodation of the people, the brethren having no expectation of having access to the houses they helped build, having been locked out, and locks being changed, and this ratified by their Annual Meeting, as already set forth. The brethren were not willing to go to law with brother for their just rights, as this would have been a violation of one of the cardinal principles ever held sacred by the brethren church. Quite a number of church-houses were built in the Miami Valley and other parts of the brotherhood during the summer of 1882.

Here it may be just to say, in order to show the reader what continued opposition this reform work of the brethren met with by their opposers, that not only were former privileges and rights denied, but many things were said to operate against them, and some things were done as it seemed to stop the building of new houses. In the fall of 1882 a church building was commenced in the Grove Church in Miami County, Ohio on a lot donated to the old brethren for the purpose of building on it a house for worship. This lot joined the lot on which stood the house which had been built in common. The lot now donated has on it a spring, and certain privileges to the water of this fountain had been granted by conveying it in pipes to the house that had been built in common. When the new building was commenced, it was set near the head of this spring for the purpose of also having the benefit of it, there being an abundance of water. After the building was well under way a suit of infringement was brought against them by their conservative brethren. The old brethren proposed a compromise, but wished to go on with their building. An injunction was served, the process of building stopped, and the old brethren were arraigned before the court on the 27th day of November, 1882. The following is the sheriff's notice to the brethren:

STATE OF OHIO,
Miami County, ss.

To the Sheriff of the County of Miami:

You are hereby commanded to notify John Filburn, Samuel Studebaker, Silas Arnold, James Brubaker, as trustees and deacons and pastors, Harrison Shull and Joseph Arnold, as pastors of the Old German Baptist Church in Bethel Township, Miami County, Ohio, James White and James Berringer, that they have been sued by Henry Gump, David Filburn, Jacob Hawver, Jacob Frantz, as the deacons, and Jacob Coppock and the trustees of the German Baptist Church in Bethel Township, Miami County, Ohio, in the Court of Common Pleas of Miami County, and that unless they answer by the 9th day of December, 1882, the petition of the said plaintiffs against them filed in the clerk's office of said court, such petition will be taken as true and judgment rendered accordingly. You will make due return of this summons on the 20th day of November, 1882.

Witness my hand and the seal of the said court at Troy this 6th day of November, 1882.

J. B. LATCHFORD.

Clerk of the Court of Common Pleas, Miami County, O.

I hereby certify that the within summons and indorsements thereon is well and truly copied from the original summons.

J. M. CAMPBELL, Sheriff.

After the case was examined by the court it was declared no infringement, and the old brethren paid their own costs and can go on with their building. The notice served on the old order brethren by the sheriff distinctly declared that they were "sued." The bringing of this suit did not only hinder the process of building for the time being, but cold weather set in, and it could not be put up and enclosed so as to protect the work already done.

Suits were also brought at other places against the old brethren by this Annual Meeting party. In Cedar County, Iowa, the conservatives sued the old brethren for the exclusive right to the church property, of which the following from the clerk will show:

In the District Court of Iowa in and for Cedar County:

This is to certify that a suit, wherein A. M. Zook, Noah Rudy, and John Zuck trustees, etc., were plaintiffs, and Samuel Musselman and others were defendants, set forth in the foregoing copy of original notice, was commenced in said court by filing of petition by plaintiffs therein on the 11th day of April, A. D. 1882.

JESSE JAMES, Clerk of District Court.

Tipton, Iowa, February 19, 1883.

In an after note from Iowa we have the following: "As it was published in the May number of the **Vindicator** the church of the brethren of Cedar County, Iowa, were sued by the conservative party for the church property of said church. This is to state to all that said suit is now withdrawn by the plaintiffs, costs paid, and both parties occupy the house alternately." This was the decision of the court, if we understand it correctly, and is what the brethren had proposed to them before they had entered suit.

In the Falling Spring Church, Franklin County, Pennsylvania, it so happened that the old order part of the church had the charge of the several meeting-houses at the time of the division. Their opposers demanded the keys, the brethren refused to give them up, knowing if they did so they would be locked out; but they opened the houses for them also and offered to do so still. But this did not satisfy them, as it seemed they wanted the exclusive right, and so they entered suit in court against the old brethren for the keys, which suit is still pending, and up to the time of this writing, April 13, 1883, they have not withdrawn it that we have learned.

The following is a copy of the notice served on our brethren:

In the Court of Common Pleas of Franklin County. In Equity Between William Tolhelm and others, plaintiffs, and David Bonebrake and others, Defendants.

To D. Bonebrake and others within named Defendants:

You, and each of you, are hereby notified and required, within fourteen days after service hereof on you, and each of you, exclusive of the day of such service, to cause an appearance to be entered for you, and each of you, in the Court of Common Pleas of Franklin County, Pennsylvania, to the within bill of complaint of the within-named William Tolhelm and others, complainants, and to observe what the said court shall direct.

Witness my hand, at Chambersburg, this 21st day of December A. D., 1881 J. McDOWELL SHARPE,
Solicitor for Plaintiffs.

NOTE.—If you fail to comply with the above directions, by entering an appearance in the Prothonotary's Office, within fourteen days, you will be liable to have the bill taken **pro confesso,** and a decree made against you, and each of you, in your absence J. McDOWELL SHARPE,
Solicitor of Plaintiffs.

Also on the 14th day of February, 1883, the conservatives of Darke county, Ohio, entered suit against the old order brethren for preaching and solemnizing marriages in the name of the Old German Baptist church.

The following petition gives the names of the several parties and the particulars:

John Bolinger, Christian King, Adam Miller, John Crumrine, **et al., vs.** Emanuel Flory, Jacob Miller, George V. Siler, Emanuel Miller, William Cassel, Joseph Arnold, Jonathan Wenrick, et al., Darke Common Pleas Court Petition.

The said plaintiffs complain of the said defendants for that they are members of and represent the whole membership of the German Baptist Church of Darke County, Ohio, a numerous body, and impracticable to bring this action in the name of all; and that the said defendants are also too numerous to bring before the court by name, dissenters from said German Baptist Church. Plaintiffs further aver that the said German Baptist Church was organized in the United States as early as 1719, and still maintains its organization; and that it has ever since its organization been styled and known as the German Baptist Church, been controlled in its church policy and ecclesiastical matters by a synod composed of members of said church from its different congregations, and designated as Annual Meetings. Plaintiffs further aver that for the purpose of settling conflicts and differences that might arise in the different congregations of said church the church was divided into districts composed of designated contiguous congregations, in which districts were held district meetings, inferior to and subordinate to the said Annual Meeting; that said district meetings were composed of members or delegates from the different congregations within said district, and that all action of said district meetings were appealable to the Annual Meeting as the final arbiter in all matters pertaining to said church; that inferior to and subordinate to said district meetings, the said church is divided into local congregations. Plaintiffs further aver that at the different Annual Meetings from time to time since 1851 up to the year 1881 certain harmless innovations were made in the ancient dogmas of said church in regard to Sabbath-schools, revival meetings, high schools, the washing of feet, etc., in consequence of which innovations the said defendants felt aggrieved, whereupon a special district meeting was called by said defendants at the Ludlow and Painter Creek Church August 24, 1881, at which special district meeting certain resolutions were passed, repudiating the action and doings of the various Annual Meetings in regard to said innovations representing Sunday-schools, high schools, missionary work, feet-washing, etc., and before passing the said resolutions the said resolutions were remarked upon by the foreman of said meetings and explained, in which he said "that all who vote for these resolutions separate themselves from the general brotherhood and its Annual Meetings;" and that with this understanding, and being well informed of what they were doing, the said defendants voted for said resolutions and thereby withdrew from the general brotherhood and its Annual Meeting and still withhold themselves from fellowship with said church. Plaintiffs further aver that in consequence of the said action of defendants in withdrawing from the membership of said church, the elders and officers of said church brought the matter before the local churches, when all of said defendants were excommunicated from said church, which action of the said local churches in excommunicating defendants as aforesaid was considered and affirmed by the Annual Meeting of said church, held at Arnold's, Kosciousko County, State of Indiana, in May and June, 1882. Plaintiff's aver that by the said action of said defendants at said district meeting at Ludlow and Painter Creek Church, Darke County, Ohio, and the action of said local churches and the action of said Annual Meeting held at Kosciusko County, Indiana, the defendants ceased to be members of the said German Baptist Church, or have any interest in or connection with said church. Yet plaintiffs aver that defendants, disregarding the rights of the said German Baptist Church and of plaintiffs, have organized new congregations under the title and name of the Old German Baptist Church, and by means of and by the use of said name, and falsely representing that they are the only true and genuine Baptist Church, thus are enabled to and are influencing members of said German Baptist Church to withdraw their connection with said church and unite themselves with said new organization, thereby disturbing the peace and harmony of said German Baptist Church, which they would not be able to do if it was not for the use of said name and such false representation; that by thus influencing the members of said church to withdraw they are producing contentions in the families of plaintiffs, and bickerings and strife between husband and wife and parent and child, members of said German Baptist Church, to the great damage of said plaintiffs and against the peace and good order of said church and of said society among the members of said church. Plaintiffs further aver that excommunicated members of said church, defendants herein, are obtaining license to solemnize marriages as ministers in good standing in said church, while in truth and in fact they are not ministers in good standing in said church, or members of said church in any sense of the word; that by thus obtaining license and solemnizing marriages they are interfering with the rights and privileges of ministers in good standing in said church by appropriating the emoluments and benefits derived from solemnizing marriages to their members of said church, which would otherwise go to the benefit and support of regular ministers in said Baptist Church. Plaintiffs therefore pray that at the final hearing of this case they may, as against said defendants, by a decree of this court, be secured in the use of the name "German Baptist Church," and that defendants may be enjoined from appropriating the said name or calling themselves the "Old German Baptist Church," and that they may also be restrained from taking out license as ministers of the Old German Baptist Church, or of solemnizing marriages as ministers of the same.

JOHN BOLINGER,
By BODLE & SWISHER, Attorneys.

The State of Ohio,
Darke County, ss.:

Personally appeared before me John Bolinger, who, being duly affirmed, says the facts set forth in the foregoing petition are true, as he believes. JOHN BOLINGER

Affirmed to and subscribed before me by the said John Bolinger this 14th day of February, 1883.

EDWARD MARTIN, Deputy Clerk.

The brethren had a consultation on the 14th of March, and decided to meet the case calmly and patiently as the Lord's people ever have when brought before governors and rulers to answer to the truth. "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

The plaintiffs say they represent the whole membership of Darke County, O. But the conservative church of Darke County manifested no disposition that we are aware of to withdraw the suit. But this suit was not entertained very long until it was met by a demur which was sustained by the court, and the court did cast out the case at the cost of those who brought the suit. It would seem like a great piece of folly for these people to bring suit against the brethren in this way under the present provisions and blessings afforded by the Constitution of the United States.

It is presumable that these steps in these various suits were taken against this reform move on the part of those who did it because they thought it their duty; and perhaps it was needful, and the Lord suffered it so to be to show a line of distinction and to prove the kind of spirits that characterized the different elements and the soundness of their faith, for by these the observer is enabled the better to distinguish according to righteous judgment.

Many incidents could be given to show how this coercive spirit manifested itself even in individual cases before and during this general separation, but it is the design of this little work only to set forth for the benefit of all sincere, inquiring minds the general principle, with its workings, which was the cause of the issues and separation of this once peaceful fraternity which made its appearance in America upwards of one hundred and fifty years ago. (See the writings of Alexander Mack.)

In conclusion we are happy and can thankfully say that the unity of practice and the oneness of mind as was once enjoyed by the church is again manifested in that part of the church which is now known and recorded as the OLD GERMAN BAPTIST CHURCH. Identity is already acknowledged, from Philadelphia to the West, at least, at the time of this writing, as far as Kansas and Nebraska, and from North to South. Nearly one hundred churches are already established.

Now, in conclusion, a short admonition to our dear brethren and sisters. We wish to say to us who have come out from those innovations, and have passed through the trials which some have, let us see well to our doings, and that we in all things endeavor to adorn in gentle meekness our humble and holy profession. Many good brethren and sisters are at this time still looking on, and are not altogether satisfied with their standing in the conservative part of the brotherhood. Our motto and aim should ever be, "By good works we constrain others." (Jesus.) "If we have not the spirit of Christ we are none of His." (Paul.)

Dear members, let us try to learn to bear our trials and any mistreatments patiently, and though we write, publish and make these things known for each other's benefit, information, and encouragement, let us not speak hard words against those who have taken from us our rights in church property. We read that some of the good people of old did take "joyfully the spoiling of their goods." No doubt they, too, at times, felt very sensibly that they were abused, but still they bore it all patiently.

We see that some of our old fathers and mothers in Israel who did much by way of building up the good cause, and brought it along until we could step in, are as illy treated as we, and they take it all patiently. Let us try and endeavor so to shape our walk and conduct in life, that when we shall depart we may leave behind us worthy examples of true holiness and piety, which shall remain as living evidences of our sincerity in the cause of our Master. And above all may we by grace divine so struggle through life and battle for the Lord that we may preserve the purity of the church, and that in her sacred duties and holy obligations—famous for the preservation and keeping of all the ordinances of the Lord's house—we hand her **one faith** and **one order** of duties and services down to our children, as our fathers handed them down to us.

AN EXTRACT FROM BRETHREN'S ENCYCLOPEDIA OF 1867

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

Perhaps there are today thousands of the professing classes of the "Dunkard Connection" who have learned to **despise** the decisions of Annual Meetings. By far a greater part of those **disunited** from the faith of the fathers, look upon them as so many "idle tales," "having no comeliness that we should admire them." But they are really to the humblest of all a source of instruction, history, and joy. The seeds of discord and faction have so increased upon the minds of many as to be incalculably many more than twenty years ago, when Elder Kurtz wrote his "Introductory Address" to "The Brethren's Encyclopedia."

'Tis true, progression was then **unnamed,** but it had received its christening in the minds of many aspirants for spreading the emotional mission movement, and for an equipage or panoply of the **"faster element"** to compete with the world's religion, and to such the **antiquated** sentiments of the ancient fathers were a stumbling stone and rock of offense. We can not better speak of these of that day than did the author of the Encyclopedia, as he and his senior brethren saw the uprising of the enemy of the meek and lowly Jesus coming, and so they believed, and so he wrote.

Believing this "Introductory Address" revelant to the book of "The Minutes of the Annual Meetings of the Brethren," we place it on the last pages of this edition, which we were authorized to publish, with the hope that we shall not be thought imprudent or censurable for so doing.

At this late date of the work (April 20, 1886) we soon expect to present all our work, both good and bad, to a generous, Christian public, asking pardon for delays over which we have had little control, but must give God, our heavenly Father, thanks unfeigned, and all the praise for the mercies many, and his superintendence over us in our ill health.

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS

BELOVED BRETHREN IN THE LORD:—It is with the deepest feelings of gratitude to God, who has been pleased in mercy to spare my unprofitable life, and to enable me, though under severe afflictions, to pass this work through the press thus far. It is also with feelings of deep humility and self-abasement, when I consider the object I had in view originally; namely, to put into the hands of my brethren of the present generation those words of peace and union which had been concluded upon by our beloved brethren of past generations under their own trials and difficulties for our present and future benefit and instruction; and, on the other hand, perceive my imperfections and shortcomings in a great many ways. It was but a very humble task to be merely the interpreter of sayings of old, and I must confess my aim was a little higher, that is to say, to furnish by dearly beloved brethren, in the "Encyclopedia," a hand-book to be consulted on any point or question that might occur to any conscientious brother in his private life, or to any church in her dealings with individual members, though it had not been presented or decided at a Yearly Council hitherto; but continued ill health prevented much scrutiny and revision, and so there was left out much which had been intended for insertion, and some few things may have slipped in which ought to have been left out, and for these things he earnestly pleads for indulgence and pardon of the dear reader.

A few words of explanation and caution seem to be necessary to those who will use this little collection of the united counsels and conclusions of our Annual Meetings, since there are different opinions about them even among brethren. Some perhaps esteem them somewhat too highly, taking them as rules and laws of equal authority as divine writ, and which, like the Persian laws, could not be altered. Others again put perhaps a too low estimate upon them, considering them as a bundle of human traditions, as they are sometimes called as **"traditions of elders,"** which we can not too soon forget and lay aside, because they think they conflict with and are contrary to the word of God, as it is written. They object when reference is made to these conclusions, and would have rather consigned them to destruction for fear they might obtain an undue influence. We honor both these opinions, for we believe they are founded upon well-intended, though perhaps mistaken views; at any rate we can not take sides conscientiously with either of these two classes, and beg leave to lay here before our respected readers, whether they have belonged to either of said classes, or whether they have, like us, occupied an impartial position, a few of our—

REFLECTIONS

upon the subject, and we hope all will give them a fair and candid consideration, they being the result of a research at once deep and earnest for nearly forty years.

1. The fundamental principles of the brethren, whether they lived in apostolic times eighteen hundred years ago, or in the Middle Ages, during the prevailing darkness of a corrupted church without a Bible, or since the reformation and the art of printing had given the Bible to every one who felt a desire for it, was **to take the pure word of God, and that alone, as the infallible rule of their faith and practice.**

2. Guided by this principle, they rejected every form of doctrine, every practice, every custom and ordinance contrary to that divine and infallible rule, and united as a church with the sincere object to follow the apostles' converts on Pentecost.— **"to continue steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship."** etc. (Acts ii. 42.)

3. But, as in the days of the apostles, there arose teachers who began to teach a different doctrine, and thus caused confusion and difficulties, we are informed how the apostles labored for union, and the brethren even in our days have tried to follow their example, especially in our YEARLY MEETINGS.

4. Now in any question that is presented, if there is an express word of God found to cover and decide this question, of course we would do very wrong to call such a decision a human tradition.

5. However, there also may be raised questions to which the Word of God affords no direct answer. If they are mere matters of opinion, not inconsistent with true faith and morality, brotherly love will be liberal and forbearing without insisting on others to be of our opinion. But if the expression of my opinions is offensive to others, brotherly affection, humility, and prudence will teach me at once at least not to give offense, and consequently to withhold the utterance of offensive opinions.

6. But if questions are of a **practical** nature, and as we are to be of one mind, and co-workers together, it becomes necessary to agree "that there be no divisions among you;" and suppose

the Word of God, and especially the New Testament, is silent on the subject, but the brethren have come to a unanimous **agreement in the matter,** all one whether it was yesterday or a hundred years ago, by brethren representing the whole fraternity in Yearly Meeting, then such agreement is binding upon **all,** as the contract of a parent or of a duly authorized agent or attorney is binding upon the children or parties, their heirs, and assigns, until it is either fulfilled, or lawfully canceled or recalled.

7. In this light, brethren, let us look upon the counsels and conclusions as solemn agreements or covenants upon which our fathers brake annually the bread of communion, and considered them as bonds of love to bind them together in union of the spirit, so as "to be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment;" and on the other hand, they considered those who would act contrary to these articles of agreement as disturbers of the peace of the church, and covenant breakers whom they could not fellowship, unless they repented indeed.

Such, my beloved brethren in the Lord, are our simple views of the minutes of our Yearly Meeting. They are NOT **laws and rules** made and enacted by some legislative authority for the government of others, because we believe Christ to be our only legislator and lawgiver, and His laws contained in the New Testament are **perfect laws,** needing neither addition nor amendments, but nothing more than to be properly understood and faithfully applied. O my brethren beloved, let us thank God daily for that perfect law of Christ which we have, and let us try to be as faithful as our brethren in times past tried to be faithful in examining and obeying that perfect law, and setting forth in those minutes a practical comment of this same law—the New Testament.

Neither can we call those minutes mere traditions of men in the sense of vain traditions, which the Savior condemned, because they (the Pharisees) "transgressed the commandments of God by their traditions." Having said something on the subject of "Traditions" in the body of this work, we refrain from saying more here, and refer the dear reader to that article where reference is there made to II. Thess. ii. 15, and iii. 6, and I Cor. xi. 2, where the observance of a different kind of traditions is earnestly recommended not only, but strongly inculcated and commanded. Let us, dear brethren, properly distinguish between traditions of Pharisaic elders, which would make void the law of God, and between traditions of our Christian elders, which only tend to the more perfect obedience of the law of Christ; prove all things by that law and we will not be led astray by traditions.

Having said here what our minutes given in this work are not—that is, neither laws nor vain traditions—we may be asked again **what they really are in our humble estimation;** and though we have intimated already more than once what we understood by them, we will try once more to elucidate and illustrate our simple ideas more fully. As in judicial court there are judges, lawyers, the contending parties, the witnesses, and all the people that choose to attend, yet none of these parties, nor all together, can bring in a verdict, but the twelve men specially selected and called the JURY. So in the church of Christ none but those who are deemed to be impartial (we think) will be able to give a true "verdict," and such we deem the conclusions of our Yearly Meetings; or, as when parties make an agreement by which they are mutually bound to perform certain expressed condtions not only they but their heirs and assigns, are bound to observe the conditions in order to enjoy its benefits, so in the church of Christ the brethren in Yearly Meeting assembled, agreeing on any point, bind not only themselves, but those who sent them, until released in the same manner; or, as parties who have been at war with each other, in order to bring about a reconciliation, a treaty of peace is drawn, and signed, and confirmed, in which the conditions to be observed by each party are stated, so when a party in the church of Christ has become estranged and desires reconciliation, in such case the terms might be called a treaty of peace, as in the former case an agreement. In fact, we may say, every Yearly Meeting was a solemn act of renewing our covenant, into which each one of us had entered, when we made a public confession of our faith, renouncing Satan, the world and all its sinful ways, and covenanting with God to be faithful even to the end at our baptism in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This covenant is **renewed** in every communion we attend, and, as to the whole body of the church, **was renewed at every Annual Meeting by the articles** agreed on, signed and sealed under the most solemn sanction of the divine presence, which had been sought by the most humble prayers of all the faithful, and by the influence of the Holy Spirit had again become united and "joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment," and by celebrating a **lovefeast,*** and partaking of the emblems of a Savior's dying love, fear, and every erroneous, dividing, and sinful sentiment was cast out by perfect love in every pious heart present. Would to God this latter feature of our Annual Meeting was restored again in these our days!

Finally, brethren, after cautioning you thus to prove all things by the infallible test of the word of God, and asking pardon for anything amiss in this work, owing to our own shortsightedness or shortcoming, and particularly for not having been able to give at this time the "Appendix" often referred to in this work, on account of continued failing health (and even not being able to promise anything further than this, that if the Lord would please to restore to us such a measure of health that we could revise this work, and "set in order the things that are wanting" in this respect, we would with His help try to do so, and if possible without further expense to our subscribers), feeling every day more sensibly our approach to our dissolution, and we hope and trust to that home which our Savior has prepared for us, scarcely hoping to see our beloved brethren any more in the flesh that live away at any distance, but still rejoicing in the lively hope of once meeting where there shall be no parting any more forever. With all these solemn feelings and impressions, we bid our readers the kindest "Farewell." May the Lord, his wisdom, and love be with us all. Amen.

(Written in June, 1867)

---

*NOTE.—At theYearly Meeting of the Old German Baptist Brethren in council of 1885, in accordance with the **intent** and **sentiment** of the Yearly Meeting held at Wolf Creek Church district for 1882 (the first Yearly Meeting of the Old Brethren after the separation in August 24, 1881, in which the District Meetings were laid aside and all the other innovations which had so unwieldly accumulated upon the general brotherhood), that even the **privilege** was not only given to hold a lovefeast at the time of the Yearly Meeting, but it was RECOMMENDED AND ENCOURAGED UP TO THIS DATE (May 20, 1886); and further the Yearly Meeting of the Old Brethren to be held at Rossville, Clinton County, Indiana, June 13th, instant, also hold one, so that what this aged author (A. D. 1867) so fervently and devoutly wished to see **restored** is now being more fully had. When we all as a united body shall have come back to the ancient order, as the Yearly Meetings were held in 1832, we will then be more fully consistent with our aged fathers upon the **manner, time** and **spirituality** of the Yearly Meetings. See Elder Henry Kurtz' notes on Annual Meeting in Brethren's Encyclopedia, page 16.